


**INDEPENDENT INDIA
AND
A NEW WORLD ORDER**



MAHATMA GANDHI

From the Painting by Miss Angela Trimulic, G. D.

INDEPENDENT INDIA
AND
A NEW WORLD ORDER

BY
Y. G. KRISHNAMURTI

INTRODUCTION BY
K. M. MUNSHI

FOREWORD BY
PROF. S. SRIKANTHA SASTRI

1943

PUBLISHERS
THE POPULAR BOOK DEPOT
LAMINGTON ROAD
BOMBAY

First published 1943
Reprinted 1944

PRINTED BY V. R. SAVANT AT THE ASSOCIATED ADVERTISERS & PRINTERS LTD
505, ARTHUR ROAD, TARDEO, BOMBAY 7, AND PUBLISHED BY G. R. BHATKAL
PROPRIETOR, POPULAR BOOK DEPOT, LAMINGTON ROAD, BOMBAY 7.

TO
PANDIT JAWAHARLAL NEHRU

CONTENTS

	Pages
INTRODUCTION : K. M. Munshi - - - - -	ix
FOREWORD : Prof. S. Srikantha Sastri - - - - -	xviii
PREFATORY NOTE - - - - -	xxxv
CHAPTERS :	
I. INDIAN CULTURE'S CONTRIBUTION TO HISTORY -	1—11
II. INDEPENDENT INDIA NECESSARY FOR WORLD ORDER - - - - -	12—26
III. MALADY OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION—FALSE SENSE OF VALUES - - - - -	27—41
IV. OFFICIAL SCHEMES FOR POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION - - - - -	42—58
V. PROBLEMS OF IMMEDIATE RECONSTRUCTION -	59—66
VI. PLANNING FOR LASTING PEACE :	
(1) LIMITED UNIONS - - - - -	67—81
(2) WORLD UNIONS - - - - -	81—90
VII. A NEW ECONOMIC ORDER - - - - -	91—103
VIII. A NEW SOCIAL ORDER - - - - -	104—180
IX. A NEW MORAL ORDER - - - - -	181—154
X. INDIA AND A CO-OPERATIVE WORLD COMMON-WEALTH - - - - -	155—184
APPENDIX :	
A. (1) FOURTEEN POINTS OF WILSON - - - - -	185
(2) THE FOUR PRINCIPLES OF PEACE - - - - -	185—186
B. THE COVENANT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS -	187—194
C. ATLANTIC CHARTER : TEXT OF THE JOINT DECLARATION - - - - -	195
D. FEDERAL UNION MOVEMENT : THE ENGLISH AND AMERICAN MANIFESTOES - - - - -	196—197
BIBLIOGRAPHY - - - - -	198—205
INDEX OF NAMES - - - - -	207—208



K. M. MUNSHI

INTRODUCTION

I HAVE great pleasure in writing this Introduction. This work of Mr. Krishnamurti's is the result of wide reading and a study of the problems affecting modern life, and it attempts to relate the discussion to the needs of India.

The underlying ideas of the book are: *First*, that Independent India is necessary for a New World Order; *Secondly*, that India must have a definite place in a co-operative world commonwealth; and *lastly*, that economic and political conditions should be subordinated to the needs of the Moral Order.

The author finds in Gandhism the key to the New World Order. As is inevitable in a young and enthusiastic author, the views of world's thinkers and general discussions occupy a large place in the book. But to the Indian reader, who is familiar only with the political discussions of his own country, it will be invaluable as an introduction to the larger issues which face the thinking man today. There is also appended to this work a draft constitution for a co-operative world commonwealth, which would prove useful to the student of federalism.

In any world order which hopes to solve the problems of this unfortunate age, the Nation-state—arbitrary and absolute—must be ruled out. For generations, the Nation-state, to use the words of Mr. Joad, “has darkened the horizon of men's lives and today drives them to their destruction.”

This Leviathan acknowledges no law and submits to no Moral Order. It has trampled upon the lives and liberties of its citizens. It has secured its freedom

by crushing their freedom. It has proved to be the enemy of happiness and culture. It has proclaimed its own worship as the be-all and end-all of life, and on its altar civilized man has sacrificed happiness, freedom, culture, life itself. Instead of being an organisation for the benefit of man, it has been a Jehovah of the Old Testament—spreading terror, all-absorbing. In any stable political order of the future, therefore, the political unit of human organisation must be enlarged. If a solution has to be found it must be in world federations of free nations, not in commonwealths dominated by a few States who possess the monopoly of manufacturing instruments of destruction as at present.

The author has summarised the official schemes of post-war reconstruction ; he has discussed in detail the Atlantic Charter of the Anglo-Saxons, the New Order in Asia of the Japanese, the Nazi New Order, the Communist New Order and pointed out the defects inherent in them all. But the immediate future is not likely to be free from the evil influences of these tabloid remedies.

These remedies are the result of certain forces which are more likely than not to frustrate any federation of free nations which may lay the foundation of a regime of peace on earth and goodwill among men. After the war Axis nations, in spite of the bitter experience of the infamous Treaty of Versailles, will be crushed, leaving the soil germinating with hate. Again, it would be surprising indeed if the United Nations did not get split into the Marxian Combine and the Anglo-Saxon Combine. It will also not be easy for the United States of America, the least hit of the United Nations, to deal with Britain whose ambition to hold an empire together at all costs has not yet disappeared. The economic reconstruction of the world also is not likely to be easy as the industrialized countries will continue to dominate the nations producing raw materials.

As the author has pointed out in his own way, a New Order cannot be built up unless Imperialism—which he

calls 'the malady of civilization'—has run out its course; and which in fact has not done so. But the manufacture of armaments is bound to be concentrated in the hands of a very few states; and, in consequence, wars of violence as between nation and nation will be rendered impossible unless the members of the military syndicate participate. Backed by military force this syndicate is likely to undertake the task, for its own benefit, of international policing and economic planning.

Modern nationalism rests on three main pillars. Borkenau thus describes them: "Economically, it is the result of a policy of state interference and state protection against the impact of the forces of international trade. Politically it is the result of democratization, of a closer link between the state and the masses, culminating in Fascist methods of creating mass hysteria. This latter is the result of the return to a tribal worship of tribal gods; "* a neo-religion, in fact. Under the influence of an international structure, however imperialist, it is likely that these pillars may be undermined.

But the principal question which interests us and with which this book is concerned is whether the British Empire will develop into such a federation as will permit India to enjoy an equal status with its other constituents. It is fashionable with some British statesmen to reiterate the untruth that India is on the verge of Dominion Status. In fact, during the last fifty years or more India has never been governed with such shameless irresponsibility as at present.

In South Africa a minority of Whites can ruthlessly oppress, segregate and expropriate the large majority of Africans and Asiatics; in India the British policy requires that monorities should be created and buttressed up by imperialist intrigue in order to keep the large nationalist majority in perpetual subjection.

This process is not likely to be stopped if the British Commonwealth after the war retains its constitution and

* Socialism: National or International

outlook. Any larger share given to the Anglo-Saxon Dominions in the affairs of the Empire is likely to worsen the future of India ; for the Whites in Africa, in Australia and in India have a racial bias not far removed from the attitude on which the doctrine of German superiority is built up by Hitler and his friends. Unless, therefore, the Britishers, after the war, develop a racially less arrogant attitude than what they possess now, the world, so far as India is concerned, is not likely to be either peaceful or free.

Another problem which will strain the wisdom of the world's statesmen after the war is how to kill the Frankenstein of Minorities which the spurious nationalism of the day has raised. It has created, for instance, India's Hindu-Muslim problem. Even Gandhiji's strenuous efforts for the last twenty-five years did not succeed in preventing the psychological antagonism which has sprung up between Hindus and Muslims in recent years. Edward Thompson in his *Enlist India for Freedom* reports the following interview with Mr. Jinnah :

"Two nations, Mr. Jinnah ; Confronting each other in every province ? every town ? every village ? "

"Two nations. Confronting each other in every province. Every town. Every village. That is the only solution."

"That is a very terrible solution, Mr. Jinnah ! "

"It is a terrible solution. But it is the only one."

This shows the absurd lengths to which the claims of minorities can go.

The minorities problem of the modern world is created by the nationalism of enthusiasm, which is fed by mere linguistic unity in Europe and by religious unity in India. Historical tradition, common culture, living memories and feelings of triumphs and trials of men living in one society go to make genuine nationalism ; neither language nor religion. India in spite of its several languages has a common culture, common historical tradition, common way of life. In Western Europe and in Scandinavia the frontiers of language and nationality are not identical.

But the nationalism based on language has played an effective part in the European crisis which led to the present war. The Germans introduced a new content into this narrow nationalism by confusing linguistic terms 'German,' 'Teuton' and 'Indo-European' with the racial term 'Nordic' in order to produce the racial myth of German superiority. Mr. Jinnah and his friends have produced in the minds of a section of Muslims the myth of a Muslim Nation on the basis of a religious bond, in complete disregard of the linguistic, traditional, cultural unity which subsists between the Muslims and Hindus in the different provinces of India.

If the world is to be at peace a minority's right to assert itself out of all proportion, both within and beyond the boundaries of a nation, has to be suppressed all over the world. The world, otherwise, simply cannot exist. As Dr. Eduard Benes wrote sometime ago out of his bitter experience of Central Europe :

Certainly every nation in Central Europe will feel it right and proper to punish severely those members of its minorities who in these terrible years have been guilty of treachery, espionage, tyranny over the majority, terror, murder, and mass-looting under the auspices of the German arms. By the same principle every state will punish its own Quislings. Until all this has been carried out, until every state feels sure that its minorities no longer can aim a revolver against its national existence, we shall have to design measures for the protection of loyal minorities, for guaranteeing them their political and cultural rights, on the basis of absolute mutuality.*

In order to tackle this difficult problem which must be solved in the interests of world peace it is necessary to have government for every state which is not merely a directorate of a company but a compact, effective and plenary government. At the same time the minorities must be taught that language or religion is only one social element of a complex whole and cannot be subordinated to all other elements which go to make up a great society ;

* "The Organization of Post-War Europe," *The Foreign Affairs*, June, 1942.

that majorities do not exist for minorities ; and that the majorities would not submit to political blackmail. The majority also has to be trained into taking the right attitude towards minorities and to realise that the most effective way of winning a minority is to try not to suppress it. If feelings are not aroused adjustment will become easy. In India Hindus and Muslims lived happily under Shivaji who fought the Muslim Emperor of Delhi and under Akbar who fought the Hindu states of the North.

But these truths, as truths, have no appeal for those who seek in minorities only useful explosives to atomise a nation. The Muslim nation myth in India has therefore to be fought ; wherever possible by introducing freedom, tolerance, reasonableness and good taste in the discussion of a problem. But the way things go at present it is difficult to discuss this problem during or after the war in the manner of a civilized person. Every attempt at a reasonable compromise has of late met more violent claims on behalf of the minorities.

The author rightly says :

The idea of an absolute right of self-determination is a mere rhetorical phrase devoid of practical meaning. Even Russia raised this slogan when it served her purpose and has evolved the multi-national state bound together by a tie of loyalty independent of and opposed to national feeling. Hitlerite Germany having used it as an instrument to tear up the Versailles Treaty has severely restricted its application in the territories that have fallen under her sway. The totalitarian character of modern warfare has rendered neutrality, however passive in character as rarely neutral in effect. The small neutral can only survive by hanging on to the skirts of a Great Power.

Therefore, the conditions of the new age demand a redefinition of the concept of self-determination. It will not hasten the disintegration if it is not confounded with the principle of nationality. The small nation markets, small nation cultures and small political structures are a restriction on a larger freedom. The nineteenth century assumption that "Nation" and "state" should coincide, must be forthwith discarded. Emphasis should be laid on the necessary limitations of this doctrine. This right should carry with it the correlative obligation to subordinate

the military and economic policy to the needs of a wider community. The divorce between "cultural nation" and "state nation" should mean that people should determine themselves into different groups for different purposes. This system of divided but not incompatible loyalties is the only workable solution. The small nations must be convinced that self-determination cannot be a reality unless it is combined with mutual aid and that independence is conditioned by interdependence.

The author has also emphasised the importance of a new economic order as a world factor. Socialist technique as successfully tried in Russia has become a world asset irrespective of the doctrines of Marxist Russia and is being adopted all over the world for the purposes of the War and will continue to be so adopted when the war ends. But the popular belief that socialism would induce a broad-minded internationalism is an illusion. The world is everywhere becoming more socialist and at the same time almost everywhere more nationalist. As has been aptly observed "The more nationalist a country the more socialist it is." The British and American nationalisms are but a diluted form of German and Russian socialisms; and Hitler has spread anti-German nationalism among the races he dominates, in the same manner as the Britishers by reaction have been responsible for the nationalism in India and Egypt.

In his chapter on Economic and Social Order the author has tried to present a picture of the new social order, which will pay a careful perusal. But the New World Order will be without a soul if men do not realise that Moral Order is the soul of all human order; that no human structure will succeed unless there is freedom for the individual to grow and life is invested with a faith in a higher and nobler destiny than mere conquest of materialistic forces.

In this aspect of the World Order the author rightly stresses the place occupied by Gandhiji and Gandhism. I only wish that in the light of his study of Western

thinkers he had elaborately treated the implications of the man and his message.

Gandhiji has a two-fold aspect. His technique,—what I called Mahayana Gandhism—has given to human society a new weapon. His personality—that of an Apostle of Moral Order—has once again related life to requirements of the divinity which resides in men.

He has provided a technique of warfare and new instruments of resistance in the shape of non-co-operation, boycott, self-immolation and mobilisation of the moral conscience of the people by inviting self-suffering on a large scale. In the conditions which will emerge after World War II, the instruments of violence will be concentrated in the hands of the victorious combine or combines ; those outside will be forcibly deprived of all arms. And to the weaker nations and the defenders of the human personality this new technique of resistance alone will be available. As of old with the early Christians against the Roman Empire, the Benares Brahmins against East India Company, Guru Teg Bahadur against Aurangzeb and Rajput women against alien invaders, so in future too only these non-violent instruments will be available to the weak to vindicate the dignity and honour of the human personality. By them alone will the individual retain his freedom in the future.

Today, when brute force flourishes all the world over, the author has rightly pointed out that the so-called materialistic outlook does not give man happiness or strength of soul or human dignity. It defies the Moral Order. It destroys Personality. In such a world Gandhiji stands for idealism ; for the supremacy of the ideal over the material. He stands for the dignity of the individual in a world dominated by deadening patternisation.

By Gandhiji's emphasis on *Satya* and *Ahimsa* he has reintegrated the concept of human dignity. Man is not a cog, nor an animal, but a divinity, a law unto himself if he pursues his own *Satya*. Looked at in this

way *Satya* is the highest destiny of man, a destiny which invests him with the privilege of living and dying for his own truth and man is not only a master of himself and his world but a spark of the Divine which no 'Special system' can or dare extinguish.

This is the challenge of Gandhiji. It is not pressed by force of arms, but by the mightier force of the spirit, by *Ahimsa* which is Love. To a war-mad world he has offered the war of the spirit. He has shown that in the triumph of ideals over appetites alone lies the future of humanity.

I wish the work the success which its author's labour richly deserves.

19 April,
26, Ridge Road, Bombay.

K. M. MUNSHI

FOREWORD

IN THIS as yet half-created, half-understood world, where Religion without Ecstasy, Law without Justice and Charity without Love attempt a delicate balance between social obligations and individual spiritual life, it is increasingly difficult because of a perverted sense of values to envisage a World-Society. The unique values of Personality escape integration into even a dynamic democratic state with its emphasis on standardization as a corollary to the materialistic trends of physical sciences and the temptation to power of vitiating the timeless spiritual values. Genuine creativeness demands a synthesis of *ethos* and *humanitas* in conformity with the laws of mediation between the phenomenal and noumenal, between the microcosm and the macrocosm, between the thesis and the antithesis. A materialistic, mechanist and fatalist doctrine of progress without purpose—whether conceived as a struggle for existence and survival of the fittest, a struggle between the “we-hold-what-we-haves” and “we-grab-what-have-nots” or a crude nationalism, resulted in a new idolatry—a worship of concepts as enduring value, pseudo-rational and anthropomorphic. The result is apparent—fear and anger, menace and humiliation, wars and increasing authoritarianism trying to impose law and order without creating peace.

The fundamental problem for a world-peace is how to rediscover the aptitude to create that peace in ourselves and educate ourselves. It will be a re-discovery because the history of humanity presents us with personalities past and present, who are “mid-wives” and mediators, who deliberately willed and created a concept of freedom

and a conquest of fear individual, tribal, national and international. Fear—the characteristic of the animal in Man has been shown by all great philosophers and prophets to be the root of “sin” assuming diverse forms of destructive herd-instincts, nationlism and sovereignties, class-wars, misuse of science and denial of religious absolutes. The comparative failure of previous revolutions can be accounted for by the fact of their being opposed by conspiracies of statesmen and politicians with no intellectual or moral integrity. The cult of patriotism resulted in a bastard nationalism begotten of inferiority-complex. *Real Politik* elevated certain territorial and economic interests to dogmas, supported by a carefully fostered popular sentiment.

The technique of revolution from nationalism to internationalism presupposes political independence. It is a preliminary but necessary phase in the world-drama of Challenge and Response which is the genesis of cultures and civilizations. Geography dominating politics, science overcoming environment, self-determination overcoming science, the spirit of the Universal overcoming self-determination—thus only social and cultural integration can transcend the centripetal tendencies towards the arrestment of culture. Independence acquires thus a new meaning which absolves it from all the sins committed in its name. Dr. Haushofer's space-concept becomes humanized when balanced with the time-concept arising out of it. The social effect of geographic expansion as conceived by the geo-politicians of the Munich School and the imperialists of the 19th century has been retarding and reactionary, resulting finally in social and cultural disintegration, a disease of civilization. *Homo Faber* is not yet *Homo Sapiens* as the advance in technique is not a criterion of social progress. Technical progress in a sense is gradual simplification but also specialization and standardization. This apparent simplicity is not a sublimation. Therefore the true indication of the growth of a civilization is the internal challenge to

the world and advance towards a true cultural self-determination.

Independence and self-determination as indicated presupposes political liberty. The main problem that confronts the world to-day is how to perfect a technique of revolution in the light of history to safeguard the evolution from the particular to the universal against any lapse. The Confederacy of Delos, the empire of Asoka, the supremacy of the Papacy in the medieval ages, the French Revolution, the imperialisms of Napoleon and of the 19th Century, the Industrial Revolution and the rise of nationalisms and dictatorships show with varying emphasis one or other aspects of etherealization and materialization in response to the fundamental instincts of the human being—fear, lethargy, food and lust. Herein lies the relativity of historical thought in indicating a differentiation of emphasis rather than of essence, of variety in human life and nature than in the underlying unity. As a political basis of such universalism, history provides us with many examples, the most recent and significant being that of communist Russia which is celebrating its silver jubilee at a time when its very existence is being threatened.

It is perhaps a significant fact that the years immediately following the assumption of the Government of India by the Crown were "Years of destiny" for the 20th century because the triumph of materialism was signalized by the publications of Darwin, Morgan, Wagner and Karl Marx. Evolution, nationalism and communism established themselves as the symbols of a new order, much misunderstood and misinterpreted but, nevertheless, destined to modify the world-outlook. They regarded Race, Nature and Matter as primary objective realities. Both administered a necessary corrective to philosophical idealism on the one hand and crude materialism on the other. Engels claimed that dialectical materialism as applied to history is historical materialism. The emergency of a high specialized *Homo Faber* and

of the proletariat coincided with the recognition that the economic structure of society governs the form of the state. The will of the state is on the whole determined by the changing needs of society according to the dialectical principles—unity of the opposites, passage of quantity into quality, negation of negation and recognition of the reality of change. The individual soul according to Freud is composed of the irrational unconscious, the ego fully conscious and more or less rational and a super-ego, ideal, more or less representing society and heredity. Darwin laid too much stress on environment and too little on internal contradictions and conflicts. Natural selection negates itself because species which do not show competitive behaviour fail to survive and in the struggle no equilibrium is possible. In the Marxist view there are creative antagonisms in nature and mind and these contradictions assure progress. Freedom is not denied but it is conditioned by social needs and survival of race. Individual tendencies being governed in different ways by different societies are of secondary importance for a world revolution directed towards changing the laws of societies. Social struggle, not social contract gave rise to the state and new class-systems which not only secured private property as against the primitive communism of the tribes but also perfected and legalised new forms of acquiring property. Therefore the state came into existence not merely to keep order or perpetuate distinctions but as an expression of a class struggle. A rational, humane and rapid revolution becomes necessary to achieve equality and liberty. Ultimately the state becomes a superfluous organism but during the period of struggle a very powerful state organisation is essential with the proviso that this new Leviathan does not establish itself as a permanent and unwelcome task-master.

The history of U.S.S.R. during the past quarter of a century is a demonstration of the same principle that characterizes the history of the League of Nations namely,

the retreat from international ideals to the concept of a nation-state, a "revolution in a single country". The difference between the two institutions, however different in their ideologies, is only one of degree. The growth of nationalisms and sovereignties in defiance of the League is paralleled by the renouncement of their internationalism of communism by Russia. Marx himself in the *Communist Manifesto* makes it clear that Nationalism will be destroyed only after a world proletarian revolution. A national revolution will be brought about by the middle classes and an international revolution by the workers who assume the leadership as a class of the fight against the middle class and abolish the old methods of production, the old class-differences and their own class and authority.

Thus national independence brought about by middle class revolutionaries under the guidance of a determined internationally minded minority seems to be an indispensable preliminary to any world-order. The course of a national revolution during a world war is determined by certain universal influences. The right wing social democrats attempt to take charge of the middle classes probably with a choice of proletarian weapons like general strikes or acting as an opposition party. This is in conformity with Marxism of 1848 which advocated a middle class revolution against the middle classes themselves by means of gradual incorporation of the lower middle classes and the peasants into the movement. The doctrinaire idealists who advocate a communist society on the basis of the primitive communism of the rural districts have to reckon with the breakdown of even this vestige of communism in an over-whelmingly agricultural country like Tsarist Russia and India and the impossibility of restoring the soviets and panchayats on the basis of a purely agricultural economy in a rapidly industrialized country, especially due to war conditions. War economics is a triumph of a dictatorial and monopolistic system. The profits of peace-time are employed for further

exploitation in the war period and the profound discovery is made that a minority of comfortable and well-fed people are constitutionally incapable of any revolutionary act. This temporary rise in the standard of living or rather in nominal wages supports imperialism whereas the masses are used as cannon-fodder and subjected to famines and food-control. Marx himself had given his blessing to the *Naro'dniki* with the proviso that the agricultural revolution should be linked to a proletarian revolution in highly industrialized countries. The national aspect was not lost sight of and Lenin himself wrote that in Asiatic lands only nationalist and deomocratic and no where proletarian revolution was possible. "We are filled with national pride and it is for that reason especially that we regard with peculiar hatred our past and present serfdom. We want to see a free independent democratic and republican greater Russia whose relations with its neighbours shall be inspired by the humanitarian principle of equality and not by the servile principle of prior or exclusive rights degrading to every great nation."

The attitude of a national party towards an imperialist war depends on several factors. A cold clear analysis of the situation is necessary. A mere passive pacifism involving the rejection of all force may bring about an invasion of the country by other enemy imperialisms and the downfall of the existing regime provides no solution. However bad and morally indefensible the war may be, the establishment of another imperialism makes a national revolution impossible for some time. Again the party might accuse the government of not only unnecessarily dragging the country into the war without express national approval but also of not conducting the war successfully. The government can throw the blame on the party itself, saying that the war could not be localized and that the party itself inspite of its protestation of patriotism is aiding the enemy by paralyzing the military effort and thus guilty of treason, sabotage and possible defeat. A third alternative sug-

gested by Engels was that the party should capture as much of power in the existing government so that in the event of victory, the revolutionary party will emerge supreme and in case of defeat, the government will disappear and in any case the autocracy must disappear. This method ignores the possibility of the establishment of another foreign dictatorship. The reactionaries in Russia advocated non-participation of the Tsarist government in the war because they were afraid that it would collapse and give room to the democrats, whereas the social-democrats and liberals advocated a party-truce during the war-time and cooperation in the war effort. Lenin was opposed to a party truce, the object of which was to stiffen the national determination by an artificial suppression of difference of opinion. A supporter of war was automatically a counter-revolutionary according to him and there should be no succumbing to imperialist propaganda. Even if the nation suffers defeat it is a lesser evil and even if the new government is a worse totalitarianism, ultimately the revolution would conquer the conqueror. A party-truce therefore savours of political opportunism. The inherent weakness of middle class liberalism becomes more and more apparent and to rescue the revolution from anarchy, the party's primary demands must be radical-democratic—the nationalization of banks, trusts and cartels, compulsory unions of industrialists, traders and proprietors and consumers' cooperative societies under state control, in a word, State Capitalism. This is opposed to the Trotskyist IV International which believes that the proletariat is the only revolutionary element and only a permanent world revolution provides a way of escape from a conflict of interests and to the idea of a Rosa Luxemburg that capitalism would automatically collapse and that alliance with the middle classes was unnecessary. She definitely accused Lenin of destroying not only the middle classes but also the workers and peasants by establishing a bureaucracy like that of the Jacobins. But Lenin even as late as 1917 held on to an ideal of a middle-class revolution in

his own country and opposed the revisionist minority, the radicals who were morally bankrupt and the Spartacists, Utopian Radicals, Anarchists and Syndicalists. He went on to assert that "Socialism is nothing else than the next step forward from the stage of monopolistic State Capitalism. Or alternatively, Socialism is nothing else than a capitalistic State monopoly worked in the interests of the whole nation and therefore no longer a capitalist monopoly." There was to be no abolition of private property or expropriation of the middle classes but a concentration of the economic life. The logic of events drove Lenin, however, to legalize the expropriations not only by the workers alone but also of the peasants. He sounded the retreat from war-time communism. In the Third World Congress he definitely asserted that a radical change was necessary in view of the grave economic distress after the world war and civil wars. "Freedom of exchange means freedom for capitalism—a new form of capitalism—a State Capitalism. State Capitalism is absolutely necessary in an exceptionally poor and backward country of small peasants. If the state controls the chief factors of economic life such as foreign trade, heavy industry, railways and banks, then it will control and regulate the private capitalism that would develop in the country and middle class." The primary need was to raise the "cultural" level of the peasants. State Capitalism combined with a systematic "cultural" drive would make the country completely socialist. "This cultural revolution makes unheard of demands both of a purely cultural (overcoming illiteracy) and of a material nature—to promote a certain development of the material means of production." Lenin emphasized this purely national aspect when he wrote to Gorki that "it is essential to take Nationalism seriously." As a logical development of this idea, Stalin inaugurated his economic plans on the theory of "socialism in a single country." Thus there was a return to the *Naro'dniki* ideal that the peasant is a potential socialist. The Russian experiment during the past quarter of a century

has demonstrated *firstly*, how autocracy can be overthrown by a determined minority; *secondly*, how a nationalist middle-class revolution is a preliminary necessity for complete socialization; *thirdly*, how by a modernized system of State Capitalism a backward agricultural country can be raised to the level of any industrialized state; *fourthly*, how national solidarity can be achieved by a systematic economic planning and reconciliation of minority claims. But national success meant international failure and the III International betrayed the communist movements in China where Chiang Kai-Shek broke the communist opposition, in Spain where Franco with the help of Great Britain and France rebelled successfully, in Italy where Chauvinist Mussolini established a dictatorship, in Germany where the communists were routed by the National Socialists, in England which became more reactionary after the failure of the general strike and labour government, in Japan, Dutch Indies and India. The communist party in India professed "to fight British imperialism and Gandhiji as a traitor to the Indian masses. It allied itself with the native bourgeoisie and intelligentsia with the intention of cutting their throats later. It took pains not to step on the religious toes of the Moslems. But the wave after wave of propaganda literature printed in Moscow and Lenin-grad and in a dozen of the hundreds of Indian languages strove to break down the most stubborn obstacle of all—the caste system of the Hindus." Here also the III International failed. Russia withdrew its feelers within its national frontiers. The Trotskyist IV International also failed to impress itself on a world, fast hurrying towards another world war. Russia itself is involved in a life and death struggle with Fascism and even if it emerges successfully, the havoc wrought by the invading armies is so great that all its energies would be directed towards the task of national reconstruction first. The international ideal would appear again in the world perhaps in a different form, because the prestige of Russia and of its national solidarity, which could withstand the

murderous blows of the *Wehrmacht*, would increase correspondingly and directly or indirectly inspire movements in other countries. In any case it leaves a record which counts as a formidable force in the future world-order. Only Russia can claim that in normal times it gave a whole nation a seven-hour working day, paid holidays, equal pay and chances of promotion, full employment and an all-round rise in the standard of living and social services. Initiative has been encouraged, understanding and conviction have come to the masses, the class-system based on exploitation and heridity has been abolished and security guaranteed to every individual irrespective of sex, religion or nationality. The war aims are as definite as the peace aims and hence the democratic will to fight and defend has been marvellously mobilized. It is inconceivable that this achievement should perish from the earth, whatever may be the temporary reversals.

It may be assumed that these ideals will endure whatever may happen to the particular form of polity and society. In hastening the realization of these ideals, it should be noted that the use of force however justifiable in a definite *milieu* may not by itself originate nor even hasten the transformation of a society. The prime factor is a conscious appreciation of the economic and political situation and the ability of a determined minority to control and direct. Poverty, injustice, brutality and repression may produce a reign of terror and atrocity and temporarily hasten the progress of the revolution. Foreign conquest irrespective of the internal state of society may bring about a reaction. History shows that a barbarism which overwhelms a more advanced nation immediately brings about an arrest of civilization until the extraneous element has been absorbed. National and social revolutions due to alien rule never produce permanent effects. Of greater importance is the conquest of space and time by science and even so the intellectual and social progress lag behind material achieve-

ments. It is easy to conceive a spiritually and socially backward nation making use of scientific inventions to preserve the old order. To attribute all revolutions to purely materialistic proximate causes on the basis of Marxian historical determinism is wrong, psychologically as well as anthropologically. The institution of private property succeeding primitive communism, chattel-slavery, wage-slavery, usury and class-war are stages in world history irrespective of social and political superstructures. The Inca civilization was communistic based on a tribal organisation without individual liberty. China had a primitive communism under a nominal theocracy with clans but no castes, with almost widespread literacy, barter system and ingrained pacifism and at the same time some scientific achievements like gunpowder, aeronautics and astronomy. But the forms of production cannot entirely explain the forms of society and government. The materialistic theory cannot account for the astonishing spread of Islam or of Buddhism over different races and cultures nor can it account for the wonderful expansion of Indian culture throughout the Pacific region and Asia. Even in European history we find episodes like the Crusades, the Reformation and the expedition of Peter the Hermit. The fanatics of pure materialistic determinism must recognise that Samkara and Buddha, Jesus and Gandhi cannot be placed on the same ethical plane as a Chicago gangster, a Rasputin or a morally pervert dictator, as if all of them function according to biologically and materialistically predetermined lines. Anti-social actions may to a certain extent be due to economic conditions but only a conscious psychological influence of those who practised a higher ethic can sufficiently account for a lasting cooperative collectivistic universalism.

An independent India's contribution towards the realization of this genuine cooperative universal commonwealth which may justifiably be styled "Gandhian International," will be founded on certain eternal values

of human life discovered and realized through five thousand years of her recorded history. Truth, non-violence, self-control and self-sacrifice are these verities. Reactionary resistance, treachery and repression on the one side and anarchist methods and counter-violence on the other cannot bring about a permanent sense of responsibility and duty. Economic history shows that production for profit and wageslavery divorced the majority from this sense and competition and *laissez-faire* inevitably bring about through the cash-nexus, over-production, under-consumption, unemployment, national wars and all the other attendant social and political evils. The way towards a cooperative world-commonwealth is made more difficult and a peaceful transformation of the society becomes impossible. The methods of organised violence to force the pace of a social revolution unless the economic and social developments have reached a certain level and the majority are able to appreciate and are prepared to support a definite programme of a National Assembly, may result at least temporarily in a military dictatorship. The army becomes the ruling party. A bureaucratic type of collectivism comes to be recognized as a necessary but temporary evil by the more intelligent individuals.

The Gandhian International therefore assumes that any international plan must start not from an entire repudiation of nationalism as such but a purified nationalism involving first of all complete political independence, national "cultural" training and full economic liberty and security of the ordinary citizen. It means in the economic field nationalization in favour of the masses of the means of production, distribution and exchange, of land, and cooperative consumers' societies and trade unions; if a war-economy necessitated state capitalism and state control of banks, currency, railways, shipping power, mines, agriculture, foreign trade, food rationing, the ratio of wages to prices, education, propaganda and social services merely for the destruction of a part of humanity and for the survival of another, how greater

the necessity for national and world reconstruction, when the people have been awakened to a realization of what collective and cooperative agencies may do for them in peace as in war? It will be a continuing education and training for the administration of their own affairs and averting them from "direct action" leading to anarchy. The fetishism of money and of extreme individualism dies out and though the reactionaries unable to resist the pressure from below may inaugurate a Civil War in a moment of madness, a mental and material revolution is inevitable.

A nation that has successfully achieved a cooperative socialist commonwealth within its own borders by non-violent means will naturally influence directly and indirectly the international order as much by its achievement as by its example. The League of Nations failed politically because it could not withstand chicane and force of the imperialist capitalist members who while philanthrophizing before the world, went on appropriating secretly. Conversely, Russia adopted a national policy and state capitalism and its brief attempt to spread communism throughout the world ended in miserable failure because of the violent means. Yet these two show what to avoid and what to strive for. A middle class state capitalism will be a half-way house and when the backward population shows its capacity for advance economically and socially, a cooperative commonwealth comes into being, the entire community giving its services for the general production and distribution of wealth for common use, and each nationality working within its own borders for a peaceful realization of cooperative ideals common to all the world, by political action.

The success of a world-federation depends on two kinds of cooperative activity, constructive and preventive, directed towards a clearly defined goal, *viz.*, the abolition of exploitation in any form. The constructive activity must start now, without delay or waiting on events from the lowest basic factor—the individual and the family

working upwards through various combinations political, social and economic to nationalism. Nationalities should achieve cooperation in an international organization, the form of which should be comprehensive of various communities at various stages of development. It is definitely not from working down from an arbitrarily determined form of an international organization that permanent peace can be achieved, as the history of League of Nations shows. Initially the individual conscience must be mobilized and security guaranteed irrespective of race, colour or nationality. The war and peace aims enunciated in the Atlantic Charter as in the Fourteen Points of Wilson or the Covenant of the League carry as little conviction to the common citizen as the Asiatic Coprosperity Sphere or the Nazi New Order because the world has so often been duped by the heartless cynicism and chicane of these Big Powers. The pernicious and sinister influence of the big capitalist and imperialist powers like Great Britain, U. S. A., Germany and Japan can and must be effectively neutralized by ever-vigilant activities of international cooperative bodies. The revival of racial and imperial dominion is still as much an avowed aim of Great Britain as of Germany and Japan, foreshadowing a war between the continents—Asia and Europe. For the same reason no continental federation of Europe or Asia should be countenanced, though an Asiatic Federation is likely to materialize if the reactionaries in Europe succeed in establishing a partial or complete European Federation. In that case there will be no guarantee of perpetual peace.

The constructive activity therefore should start from small, well disciplined and organised bodies in every state throughout the world on the lines of Peace Brigades suggested by Mahatma Gandhi. The members of such bodies should have the courage to suffer for their convictions and fight uncompromisingly the reactionaries in their own state. It is their selfless sacrifice and adherence to truth and non-violence that converts the masses

and rouses the conscience of the individual. It is the best form of propaganda and true internationalism. Non-cooperation with evil and cooperation in achieving the good of mankind go together. The pacifists of Europe who condemned war before 1939 failed to realize this truth and their platitudes now sound like mockeries. Their convictions were derived from the fundamentally dualistic religions of Semetic origin and a fountain can rise no higher than its source. The anthropomorphism of these religions has unconsciously brought about a state of affairs where high ideals are defeated by low practices. Therefore the new peace-brigades will inaugurate a new education system. The civic, national and international machinery will be transformed from instruments educating for death to educating for a full and well-ordered life of the individual. An international university, a world-encyclopaedia, an internationale of Science and Art no doubt have their use but by themselves do not solve the fundamental problem—the moral education. Self-Government will not be put in opposition to good government. Unlike the soviets based on a purely materialistic philosophy, the peace-brigades without neglecting material welfare lay emphasis on individual liberty, toleration and charity.

Apart from this work of national and international construction, on the preventive side the net-work of peace-brigades (or whatever they may be styled) extending all over the world can use their enormous moral prestige to prevent a recrudescence of racial bigotry, religious fanaticism, economic discrimination and exploitation and social antagonisms. Whatever the form of national government, there is always the danger of a reactionary minority exploiting the ignorance and apathy of the masses and it will be against this danger that the peace-brigades, themselves above suspicion because of their sufferings and convictions, will wage unceasing war, with non-violence and non-cooperation as their weapons. Nationalism and sovereignty will no longer hinder world-

co-operation. An international air force, police and army may be necessary in a period of transition but they are necessarily evils and instruments of coercion, not of conversion which is the ideal of Mahatma Gandhi.

Life will have no meaning and civilization no value if a new order creates a social mentality destroying humanity and power of reflection as in the present plutocracies and dictatorships. The so-called realism is the producer of a false confidence in facts relying on organizations. Therefore a firm ground for a new world-reconstruction is provided only by reasoned ethical ideals which give us a normal relation to reality. An age is provided with its *Weltanschauung* by personalities and this world-view must be based on certain conditions. It must create a belief in thought and a reverence for truth. Thought is not necessarily confined to the realm of ratiocinations and belongs to mysticism also. Again a world-view must be optimistic and ethical, affirming life as against anarchy in nature. Spengler's theory of decay of civilization is only partly true. No civilization is so unique as Spengler tries to make out for no civilization can be entirely static; it is Being moving towards Becoming and mutations occur. The apparent differences between civilizations are due to differences of emphasis than of essence. The Hellenic civilization, which has no organic connection with modern European civilization according to Schweitzer, emphasised the aesthetic; the Christian civilization stressed faith and hope; the modern western civilization gives importance to machinery and materialism; China attached great importance to ethics—individual and social; the Arabs spread the idea of human brotherhood. On a superficial view these differences may appear to mark off one segment of humanity from another but a true synthesis is provided by the Indic spiritual habitus. The unique philosophy of absolute non-difference, without any reservations regarding an anthropomorphic deity or a particular race, class or creed, reconciling action and knowledge, the rational and the

aesthetic, has been India's supreme gift to the world. It provides the elan, the direction to the actions of Mahatma Gandhi and identifies his life with action. Such as he are the salt of the earth and if a social conflict is precipitated, they alone can produce a new social equilibrium. Worlds and empires, dictators and war-lords pass away but the influence of such creative souls as Gandhiji can never pass away.

*Mysore,
December, 1942.*

S. SRIKANTHA SASTRI.

PREFATORY NOTE

TO-DAY WHEN freedom, security, justice, peace and truth are struggling to overcome the forces of evil throughout the world, and even historical and religious truths are being deliberately perverted to support the existing regimes, it is necessary that a true appraisal of the current forces in the world should be made from the viewpoint of Independent India.

It is remarkable that no thinker has hitherto indicated India's role in a New World Order and this is not so surprising in view of the fact that many of the statesmen, who today are in control of the destiny of the world still betray an imperialist mentality and have made many commitments to restore the *status quo ante bellum*. India still is conceived as an appanage of the British Commonwealth and as a mere geographical expression.

The purpose of this volume is to indicate the significance of the New Era inaugurated by Gandhian ideology. In the light of Indian and world history the unique position of Mahatma Gandhi is envisaged as the precursor of a new epoch and inspire of special pleadings of vested interests, who are anxious to put morality outside the pale of history and politics, it is our firm conviction that Gandhi's gospel of truth and non-violence can generate an invincible power "to break the ring, the vicious circle, the dance round and round the mulberry tree, the poison tree of intellectual harlotry,"

Because of this belief that delivery of the world can come only through education in the immortal spiritual truths discovered in India and put into action by Mahatma Gandhi and that somehow, somewhere, somewhen would prevail that we are offering this book to wishers of humanity.

My best thanks are due to Mr. K. M. Munshi, a senior politician and a paramount authority on Indian culture, for having contributed a masterly Introduction in spite of heavy public duties. I am grateful to Professor S. Srikantha Sastri, the eminent historian, for giving me his valuable guidance in the preparation of this monograph. I consider myself fortunate in securing a most illuminating and almost prophetic Foreword from such an authoritative source.

To Mr. Morarji Padamsey I owe a debt which it is not easy to acknowledge in terms which shall be at once adequate to my sense of obligation and not repugnant to him. Let me express my gratitude to him for his suggestive encouragement.

My warm thanks are also due to Mr. D. S. Dalal, whose unwearying intelligence has rendered the publication of this monograph in an attractive form possible.

I am grateful, too, to Miss Angela Trindade, Mr. V. V. Wagh, Mr. Kanu Gandhi, Mr. Bhogilal J. Mistri, Mr. Counsic, Mr. V.N. Kak and Sri Vijaya Devi for the painting, photographs and the map which are reproduced here for the first time. It is an equal pleasure to acknowledge the co-operation of Professor V. Raghavendra Rao, of the Mysore University, Mr. N. G. Jog, of the *Bombay Chronicle*, Mr. C. Hanumantha Rao, Librarian, the Mysore University Library, Mr. V. P. Venkataramiah and Mr. S. V. Murti. To these my chief debts are owed; but I have many other creditors including the often thanked Mr. G. R. Bhatkal, Proprietor, The Popular Book Depot, whose advice and assistance were always at my command.

Y. G.

1 INDIAN CULTURE'S CONTRIBUTION • TO HISTORY

THE PAGEANT of history presents us with the irrefutable lesson that the methods of violence and force always fail to secure peace and the development of civilization. The solution to the present strife must be found in a technique which eschews the principle of force. If the instincts of freedom and domination are co-equal, in the social order, the climate of the period is determined by the importance of these urges, toleration or blind selfishness. Our age with its quests for power betrays signs of spiritual exhaustion. The western civilization, though *in extremis*, can yet be saved and then the future world state exists to provide peace and there should be no right to any liberty save a rational liberty that involves peace.

We can turn to the pages of history to forecast future possibilities even though its accumulated principles and facts may not at once yield a pattern. In hypothetically given institutions the individuals can be relied upon to pursue similar courses of action. This is the thesis maintained by philosophers and politicians from Machiavelli to Marx.

The world War I resulted in bitter disillusionment which almost broke the spirit of the western world. Oswald Spengler with his characteristic thorough and dramatic methods propounded a new theory of culture-history and predicted the collapse of the western civilization.¹ He attempted to formulate some general laws of culture-history based on what he thought to be the ultimate basic realities that underline every phase of cultural development. After a planned review of all important cultures of the world—Egyptian, Greek, Roman, Chinese, Indian and Magian, he arrived at an organic theory of culture origins and decays. He argues that just as the lives of human beings exhibit a progressive growth from infancy to old age, so also do the cultures in which the human life finds its communal

1 Oswald Spengler, *Decline of the west*, Vols. I and II.

expression. A culture is defined as "the working being of a single huge organism which makes not only custom, myth, techniques and art but the very people and classes incorporated in itself the vessel of one single form-language and one single history." Like the human beings the culture exhibits a capacity for growth and change and when a culture stops growing it becomes a civilization. A civilization is a fixed and static form and thus represents the consummation of culture.

The views of Spengler on Indian cultural development are erroneous. As the chief aim of this work is to show what peculiar contributions an independent India can make to world peace and unity, a critical examination of the opinions of this great German thinker will not be out of place. Professor S. Srikantha Sastri was the first scholar in the east to expose Spengler's factual inaccuracies and tricks of reasoning.¹ Spengler asserts that the Classical Indian Man had no memory, no constant impression that the individual life is an element in a far wider life course. As contrasted with the Egyptian, the Indian Man forgot everything as symbolised by burning of the dead and the absence of an art of portraiture. In Indian culture there is perfectly a historic soul—its decisive expression being the Brahman Nirvana. There is no pure Indian astronomy, no calendar and, therefore, no history—so far as history is the track of conscious spiritual evolution. Therefore, he argues that the conception of world history as a picture of world-in-progress is the peculiar product of the western soul.

Professor S. Srikantha Sastri challenges Spengler on points of fact and shows his inconsistency and self-contradiction. According to him the doctrine of Karma which forms the basis of all forms of Hinduism is but the assertion of the persistence of memory of previous acts in the present and the present actions in the future. Ancestor worship which is enjoined on every Hindu is a more subtle form of expressing the transcendental nature of consciousness than the crude Egyptian method of mummification and of restoring to granite or basalt for the preservation of the mere flesh. The elaborate administrative system and the net of irrigation works, which according to Spengler show not only a care for the past but also a victory over mortality and the mere present, were not exclusively Egyptian.

1 S. Srikantha Sastri "Oswald Spengler on Indian Culture." *The New Era*, March, 1929.

A little knowledge of the history of ancient India would reveal the extraordinary complexity of the administrative system ranging from pure anarchy and democracy to imperialism. In Professor Srikantha Sastri's view, Spengler has confused the ideas of Buddhist Nirvana, which according to him is the final expression of Indian culture, with that of Brahman. He contends that Brahman is certainly not a negative concept, an obliteration of all spiritual consciousness. It is doubtful if Buddha ever conceived Nirvana as the grand symbol of a zero (*sunya*). He refutes the argument of Spengler that Indians lacked time-consciousness when he says that the *Vedanga Jyotisha* and the *Taittiriyaaranyaka* expounded principles of astronomy which are certainly indigenous. Kala or Time was merely phenomenal, being understood in terms of Nama and Rupa (Name and Form). It is a cause as it does not exist in eternal substances (*nityeshvabhavat*).

The taunt of Spengler that the Indian soul passes through a dreamy existence with no awareness of the world around elicits a remarkable reply from Professor S. Srikantha Sastri. He says what is impossible for the Western Man to understand is that there can be an intense individual existence conforming to the system of World-as-Nature and at the same time being independent of it. Personalities are as land-marks in western history directing and controlling the trend of events so far as is possible within the limits set by destiny. This indicates an inequality in the nature of the world where the individual is but an ineffectual atom of the group. In India on the other hand, there was a complete divorce between the concept of the phenomenal life of the world and the real life of the individual. The World-as-Nature is an illusion and not an absolute reality by itself. The Advaita doctrine thus places before the world a conception of real democracy in a world of truth. The singularism of Samkara admits of no weakness and it is the most logical and rational conclusion that can be arrived at from the facts of consciousness, as apprehended by the Indian soul. Thus it is not true to say that Indian culture in the spiritual field attained its culmination with Buddha and the conception of Nirvana, but rather with Samkara and his Advaita doctrine in the seventh century.

The personality and individuality of each self was assured to the Indian not by self-aggrandisement but self-effacement.

The Universal (jati) is not different from the Particular, the Class from the Individual according to Kumarila. The social group has no distinct individuality of its own apart from each individual. It is not correct to say that speculations like that of Janaka, Yajnavalkya, Pippalada, Bhṛugu, Kapila, etc., had no individualities of their own. They emphatically assert the feeling of Time, Consciousness and Fate. Therefore, Professor Srikantha Sastri says that Buddhism was not the perfect and final expression of the Indian soul as Spengler believes. It is but an early land-mark in the spiritual evolution of the Indian soul, the culmination of which was the Advaita doctrine. He remarks "It is nearer to the truth to say that the non-dualism of Saṃkhya with its relentless logic formed the crown and summit of Indian thought. It left no scope for human weakness (*nayamatma balahinena labhyo*) for Bhakti, for prayer on the assumption that *avidyā* (nescience) is the prime cause for such misapprehensions. Therefore, we can say that by the tenth century, Indian cultural development entered upon its final phase after which civilization sets in."

The history of Indian cultural development is one of spiritual growth and acquired profound significance only when viewed from the point of India's distinctive contribution to the world. According to Professor Srikantha Sastri, the culture-period begins somewhere about 3000 B.C., when the Destiny-Idea of the Indian soul acquires a form-language of mystic symbolism and not in about 1500 B.C. as Spengler believes. The early period is characterised by a new rousing of the feelings of curiosity and World-Fear leading to beautiful literary creations longing to solve the problems of life and destiny, and extends up to 1500 B.C. The later period, when metaphysical speculations acquired a strong scholastic flavour and a purely philosophical outlook of life and feeling come to indicate a ripening critical consciousness, as in the period of the Aranyakas and Upanishads, may be said to extend down to 1000 B.C. This period can be said to have been succeeded by the early period of Autumn of Culture—when a puritanic ritualism, and mathematical conceptions of form and feeling as in the Brahmanas and the Sūtra literature predominate. The latter half of this period witnesses the highest point that can be reached by the genius of the nation. The numerous philosophical schools laying stress on rationalism and intellectualism such as Buddhism in all its phases, Sāṃkhya, Vaiśeṣika, Nyāya, Yoga, Jainism,

Pancharatra. etc., finally and logically lead up to Samkara's non-dualism.

Says Prof. Srikantha Sastri "The period of Indian civilization can be said to commence from about the tenth century A.D., when the spiritual creative force peaks and pines. Ethical and ritualistic dogmas loom large; the caste-system acquires rigidity; disproportionate attention is bestowed on dry philosophical discussion often degenerating into mere quibbling; the memory for Feelings becomes a memory for Forms and finally a pessimistic interpretation of Karma spreads over the whole continent, destroying all feelings of hope and strength, killing all ideas of Beauty, Truth and Freedom." Thus was the initial Destiny-Idea of Indian culture worked out. It was spread over a long period of time, but it is apparent that it followed the same organic laws of growth and decay as other cultures of the world *though its significance is quite different.*

After the tenth century, particularism and the individual took the first place and not God and Universalism. There was an end of freedom. Freedom without the ethical basis of truth and helpful love degenerates into a phrase. Only when we recognise one universal being, can there be freedom with authority, independence with community. A perversion of this principle "All for me, I for none," was enshrined in the Medieval Empires. The selfishness of classes outweighed their sense of community and the nation came to the edge of ruin.

The smallness of spirit and anxious striving after security that flowed from it may be ascribed to the dualistic philosophies of the time. The moral teachers who followed Samkara were undoubtedly great spirits. Dualism is as much ethical as universalism but love from oneness or non-difference alone is goodness without sentimentality. Then one can be useful in the service of reconciliation and brotherly love. It makes possible the Sovereignty of God and the Dignity of Man.

In Medieval India there were nationalisms, both genuine and spurious. The cultural nationalism of Vijayanagara was based on fundamental spiritual values. However, a living force for good can only come from a link with the source of goodness. Here lies the strong roots of Indian culture. The destiny of India in the new world which is struggling to be born, is to seek for greatness in suffering and love. In this spiritual sense we are the wardens of the universe.

Great civilizations have, normally rested upon inspiring ethics. When faith in real values weakens, life narrows down from a spiritual drama to a biological episode. Phrases like "everything had progressed except man, all history appears as a futile whirl-gig" are heard when men are shorn of the consoling faith in God.

Turgenev said that the forked radish called man is just one species among billion and that Nature entertains no preferences as between men and fleas. In the scientist's view we are trivial fragments, flying off at a tangent towards destruction. The critics of mechanism argue that science seems to kill whatever it touches, reducing soul to brain, life to matter and personality to chemical analysis.

The immense achievement of the human spirit is now crushed to earth, perhaps never to rise again. The advance in physical sciences and technology gave the power over Nature which enabled man to provide the conditions of the decent life. The knowledge and power which science gave man carried him with a frightful momentum. Since the time of Galileo, physical science has made astonishing progress but the science of life has lagged behind. Says William McDougall¹ "Penetrate to remote jungles of Malaysia and see the naked savage using lucifer matches from Japan, cotton cloth from Manchester, pottery from Staffordshire, a rifle from Hartford, conn, and perhaps spectacles from Birmingham." In the industrial field, revolution in productive methods may mark and make the rise and fall of nations. But control of the human and social factors of western civilization is far behind the material development.

Ex-President Hoover complains that we are suffering from a subsidence of our foundations. Western civilization has brought about self-destruction on itself through its own achievements. It is top-heavy and lop-sided. We are sufficiently humbled before the immensities of Time, Space and Matter and, therefore, the advocates of the philosophy of determinism argue² "I see little evidence in this world of the so-called goodness of God. On the contrary it seems to me that, on the strength of His daily acts, He must be set down the most stupid, cruel and villainous fellow. The noblest man, I think, is that one who fights God, and triumphs over Him." This tough-minded philosophy of mechanism ignores the basic fact that we have ultimate

¹ William McDonald, "World Chaos", 1981.

² See Will Durant "On the Meaning of Life", 1988

ends and it is quite rational to regard them as God. The spiritual values like Truth, Toleration and Fearlessness are instinctive growths implying an organic process of delicate adjustments between the individual consciousness and Nature.

Sophists may say that life is a brief moment in the trajectory of a star. But as André Maurois observes "you do not live in the earth, you live in yourself." Self-fulfilment is impossible if men can bear to live without God. A religious fervour is evidenced even in the new totalitarian political ideologies. They all conceive the secular state as the instrument of a Divine mission—to secure the victory of messianic proletariat, the mystical Third Reich, or the inspiration of God.

The Christian Pacifists aspire to change the world into a world of ordered peace. Toleration is a "Christian" virtue. But for over 1300 years the Christian Church was professedly intolerant. When the United Nations claim that they are fighting for liberty, it is for the practice of toleration that they are fighting. We have to fear to-day the quasi-religious intolerance of the defied state as well as the perpetual intolerance of the imperialist powers. Violence begins where toleration ends.

The heads of the Christian Churches formulated a year ago five standards for a new society :

- i. Extreme inequality in wealth and possession should be abolished.
- ii. Every child, regardless of race or class should have equal opportunities of education suitable for the development of his peculiar capacities.
- iii. The family as a social unit must be safeguarded.
- iv. The sense of Divine vocation must be restored to man's daily life.
- v. The resource of the earth should be used as God's gift to the whole human race, and used with due consideration for the needs of present and future generations.

But in this grandiose scheme¹ the missing point is the ethic of Christ, Love. A more "Christian" society can be planned only on this enduring ethical value. If the church is a minority group in the world of to-day, the reason is it has failed to live

¹ John Middleton Murry, "The Possibility of a Christian Society". *The Fortnightly Review* January, 1943.

strictly to an absolute ethic and the cleric has become the "Yes-Man" of the politician.¹

Moral values must be observed regardless of the cost either to the individual or to the society. The politician-saint who withdraws himself from the scene to remain true to his code, lifts the moral standards of the whole group. Sometimes he participates and influences decisions but is prepared to dissociate from political movements, the moment a decision is called for that would cause him to violate his *a priori* rule. However grave the effects upon his cause, he abides by his code. To say that such a type of leader is inconsistent and does not consider the social consequences of his approach only indicates a passion for unreason. This absolute pacifism does not sanction the use of violence or the initiation of moves which might culminate in violence.

There is a significant gulf between him and the neo-Machievallian. The latter does nothing to raise the level of political strategy. For example a passionate desire to make America strong in the long run may assure the collapse of the Hitler system, but it may also produce a new devastating democratic imperialism. Therefore the neo-Machievallian is not merely helpless in forestalling this outcome but he even tends to accelerate its pace.

The absolute pacifist believes in the existence of the conscience of the civilized world, while the neo-Machievallian is full of patent cynicism. To the former the virtues of freedom, tolerance and co-operation are more lasting and true than those of power and the aggressive use of power. It is said that the common mistake of the pacifist is that he defines good as an ethical imperative, an ethic of right action. He identifies what is one ultimately after, with what he believes ought to be done at the moment. The identification of the good and the right gravely imperils the purpose his ideas serve. The one is a criterion of value, the other is an ethic of action.² Obviously such critics ignore the truth that goodness implies rightness.

The neo-Machievallian falls into a major error. He proposes to leave personal matters to the jurisdiction of his absolute

1 In *The National Review*, 1931, the Late Duke of Northumberland wrote "It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that the element of decay which we have observed in recent European history must eventually destroy the remaining institutions on which our society is based, because the foundations of those institutions, religion and nationality, have lost or losing their force".

2 Dorothy Fosdick, "Ethical Standards and Political Strategies", *Political Quarterly*, June, 1942.

ethic, while recognising a special political ethic made up of adjustable rules of action. The practice of unethical code in one sphere will inevitably tempt him to break company with ethical standards in the other sphere. The ideal good must be accepted beyond the partial values of political life and thus there should be a recognition that both the goal and the means of strategy must be pure and most conducive to the good.

It has sometimes been suggested that we should select the objective of social justice and not merely social order, since social order may be based on an exploiting tyranny. The answer is, we insist neither on social justice nor social order but on a just social order. While to some extent we recognise that strategy is not slavishly bound to principles, yet we are convinced that it should be based on practices that least violate the final good. Therefore the absolutists draw a sharp line between action informed by principle and action arising from expediency. And they do not sacrifice their moral qualities for the success of their schemes.

The absolutists advocate non-violent technique to promote or achieve ultimate ends because such tactics do not destroy but enrich life. Only man's lack of faith in the dynamic strength of this great creed can destroy that creed. Some of the old doubts about the effectiveness of this spiritual weapon must be stilled. Non-violence, its critics argue, is an assertion without a quality as it is solely the negation of the quality of violence.¹ It is something that is not something else and consequently its relation to other things terminates in an impalpable void. As it is less than nothing, it is impossible to realise it even in thought. It is a denial of violence. If any one of these two be absent, non-violence would be absent.

Again, the critics contend that virtue can never be expressed in negative forms. "Love the enemy" for instance, can never be a virtue. For when love is, enemy is not, and when enemy is, love is not. Non-violence as bare denial of violence is unmeaning. Violence in man cannot be denied without affirming in him the pre-existence of a quality which would oppose violence. Significant non-violence as opposed to bare non-violence has within itself the forces of violence not less effective and operative than violence itself. A thing can exist and be understood only in relation to its opposite.

1 Charu Chandra Sinha "The Philosophy of Non-Violence," *Hindustan Review*, April, 1942.

As reality is a distinctive totality, there must be a positive unity of diversities each of which is one and not the other. Violence, an aspect of totality, would of itself be a transition to non-violence, the other aspect of totality. Here synthesis is not mere synthesis but self-completion of violence or non-violence. Non-violence is self-contradictory and therefore destroys itself if left alone and by itself. There is no contradiction between violence and non-violence when, conjoined together, they are subdued into something into the character of the whole.

Reality is not merely one and self-consistent but is a system of reciprocally determined parts. As reality becomes an articulated system, the value of non-violence approaches more and more nearly to that of violence with which it finally becomes equivalent. Non-violence is destroyed violence, and violence is vanished non-violence, and since violence does not exist without non-violence nor non-violence without violence, non-violence is a relative violence and violence is a relative non-violence.

But a true understanding of the function of negation demonstrates the spuriousness of this reasoning. In the proposition "No violence should be done to all Creation" the function of the negative particle has been shown to be not merely indifference or refraining. To say that violence and non-violence go together and one inheres in and presupposes the other and are inseparable in all judgments, is wrong because like light and darkness there is mutual opposition and cannot exist in the same thing either from the cause or effect view points. Negation is in fact assertive and this assertion is not a vague extension to all infinite categories excluding the object immediately denied. This special kind of negation has objective validity in a transcendental reality. Just as in sense perception there is a cognition of pure reality in the element "this" in the proposition "this is a jar," similarly negation is also a transcendental Thisness. The non-existent thing is not an imagined thing. It is a double reality—objective and subjective. It can be a special primordial source of knowledge and action, co-ordinated to inference and not subordinated to it. As Samkara says, negation may become quiescent like a fire having consumed its fuel, by opposing its immediate object. Hence the negation of violence carries a double connotation—the non-

existence (prior, destructive, mutual or extreme) of violence and also the existence or affirmation of a higher reality which may be co-ordinated to ethical activity.

This principle of a universal self-functioning on the basis of fearlessness, truth and non-violence has been and will be India's unique contribution to the suffering world. Fearlessness presupposes independence, truth implies intellectual and moral integrity and non-violence a spiritual regeneration and real education. India's message to the world will be effective only when these principles are allowed free scope and hence the pre-requisite is national independence.

self. The great vigorous movement launched by this detached man is heralding a moral renaissance which will transform the universe into an Olympiad of the Spirit.

The Indian National Congress is a political movement which, since its inception in 1885, has consistently claimed to speak for Indian opinion. Two decades ago it came under the spell of Gandhi, who gave an ethical basis to this political organisation. For the individual it prescribes self-discipline as a preparation for freedom; for the community the expression of the popular will through the adult suffrage and its realization through the will of the majority; for the nation, national independence which implies international interdependence. It has endeavoured to remedy social abuses as a means of integrating national life. This biggest political body in the world with a mass membership of over five million is so attached to the Gandhian way that it is not prepared to leave him even when he abandons it and substitute for it another way. Moral force exerts not power but influence. Gandhi's hold on the imagination of the masses has an immense meaning and message for the contemporary west. His moral teachings might be shocking to the conventional many. The rationalists who try to explain Nature fail to understand Nature in its relations to life. They regard the understanding of the Ego as the measure of all things. Therefore, their attempt to evaluate Gandhi's absolute ethic with material standards seems futile as would be the endeavour to ascertain the perfume of a flower with a yardstick or a weighing machine. Gandhi has presented a new ideal of life. The joy of spiritual life whose strophes must be unceasingly sung to a pauperised, mechanised and nihilistic mankind is the best prophylactic of the endemic disease of homicidal impulse and materialism.

The Congress is solidly behind him because it intuitively acknowledges the superiority of his strategy, for Indian revolution. Addressing the historic session of the A.I.C.C. at Bombay on August 9, 1942, Gandhi exclaimed "The resolution that is placed before you says that we don't want to remain frogs in a well. We are aiming at World Federation. It can come only through non-violence. Disarmament is only possible if you use the matchless weapon of non-violence. There are people who may call me a visionary, but I tell you I am a real *Bania*, and my business is to obtain Swaraj. If you don't accept this resolution I won't be sorry for it. On the contrary I would

dance with joy because you would then relieve me of the tremendous responsibility which you are now going to place on me. I want you to adopt non-violence as a matter of policy. With me it is a creed, but so far as you are concerned, I want you to accept it as a policy. As disciplined soldiers you must accept it *in toto* and stick to it when you join the struggle." This very humane yet firm appeal of Gandhi vividly shows him as a moral genius. Shelley defines a man of genius as one, who "beholds the future in the present, and his thoughts are the germ of the flower and fruit of latest time."

The Congress leaders have declared their hostility to Nazism and Facism, but they also have grudges against imperialism. The two questions posed were: "Do you incorporate in your war aims the declaration by Congress on India's status?" and "Do you agree to the powers and composition of the body which shall draw up the constitution?" In point of fact the Congress demanded the honest renunciation of privilege and exploitation by Great Britain.

The war found India in a curious constitutional position. The Government of India Act, 1935, which was designed to establish a federation between British India and the Indian States, had been partly implemented in 1937 by the introduction of provincial autonomy in eleven British Indian provinces. The system of administration at the centre remained the same as that which had been set up under the Act of 1919. Central authority was in British hands amenable only to a semi-responsible legislature. While anxious to play a part in the war against Hitler System, the Congress felt itself in an invidious position in allying itself with the imperialism it had always denounced. It felt that India was declared a belligerent without any popular form of consent.¹ The Congress could not forget over-night its ideals and sacrifice. Therefore, in the autumn of 1939 the Congress ministries resigned.

Gandhi declared that his own sympathies were with England and France purely from the humanitarian angle. In his personal appeal to Herr Hitler he wrote "It is quite clear that you are to-day the one person in the world who can prevent a war which may reduce humanity to the savage state. Must you

1 "Mr. Chamberlain's government swept three hundred millions of Indians as belligerents into this war, without troubling to seek their consent.....the government of eight of the eleven provinces resigned as a protest against our treatment of India as a passive pawn in the game of power-politics". H. N. Brailford, *America, Our Ally*, p. 115, 1940.

pay that price for an object, however worthy it may appear to you to be? Will you listen to the appeal of one who has deliberately shunned the method of war not without considerable success?" Gandhi, like all mystics is intensely concerned with ultimates; but politics cannot ignore immediate issues which clamour for a solution, however tentative or inadequate. Some Congressmen while devoutly sharing Gandhi's hope that ultimately faith in non-violence would become universal, could not disguise from themselves the fact that the growth of tyranny should be checked by all means. Aldous Huxley points out that the great paradox of politics is the fact that political action is necessary and at the same time incapable of satisfying the needs which calls it into existence.¹ This is because politicians can do little for the general good unless the people transform their personality. And he rightly urges that it is in altering the individual, the method of the mystic has its place. The spiritual regeneration which he alone can work is of over-riding importance than the practical reform the politician can effect.

A very considerable section of Congressmen felt that the Congress should assert itself once again as a political organisation and begin to function effectively. But Gandhi has claimed that Satyagraha is also political action. In the midst of a catastrophe without parallel, India had to decide what part she was to play in the European drama. "India's political deliverance will come" said Gandhi "but what will it be worth if England and France fall, or if they come out victorious over Germany ruined or humbled?" Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said that he would like India to use her strength and resources in favour of possible good causes. In the present world conflict we must sympathise and wish well to the group which contains the progressive forces. Britain's attitude towards India's freedom-demand makes it impossible for the latter to throw her full weight into the struggle, but if the Congress demand were accepted "the inevitable drawbacks and obstacles towards giving support to the Allied cause would then be removed." It is the representatives of the peoples of India that should decide how India could give practical effect to its undoubted

¹ "The consent of the 310,000,000 people of British India was neither sought nor obtained. They had no voice in the gravest decision that can be taken by a nation. They were at war whether they willed it or not. The fact that most of those able to speak for the people of India hate Nazidom and would in fact at that time have been ready to support Britain in war against it makes no difference. They were not consulted. Any talk of a 'large measure of Indian self-government' became in face of that stupendous fact, a blatant hypocrisy which rightly damages our moral position in the world". Francis Williams. *Democracy's Last Battle*, p. 217, 1942.

moral support to that cause. To switch upon the nation to a war-basis, he urged for the establishment of a truly National Government. Meanwhile the Congress could not hibernate and protect the liberties of the people against executive encroachment, strengthen their morale in the grim days ahead and safeguard against the country's permanent interests being damaged by hasty or improper state-action in the name of the war-emergency.

On September 11, 1939, the Viceroy announced that the compulsion of the international situation had prompted His Majesty's Government "to hold in suspense the work in connection with preparations for freedom while retaining federation as our objective." Again in an elaborate apologia issued on October 17, 1939, the Viceroy said that at the end of the war His Majesty's Government "will be very willing to enter into consultation with the representatives of the several communities, parties and interests in India and with the Indian Princes, with a view to their securing their aid and co-operation in the framing of such modifications as may seem desirable" in the federal scheme which was put on the shelf. This conveniently vague declaration was pieced together from the preamble of 1919, the Irwin Declaration of 1929 and the Viceregal Instrument of Instructions of 1939. The declaration about the goal was redundant and the promise about consultation after the war came nowhere near satisfying India's unanimous demand. Instead of actually initiating the process of transfer of power what the Viceroy envisaged was the antithesis of "Dominion Status in action."

The Working Committee showed itself strongly against the ideology and practice of the totalitarian systems, with "their glorification of war and violence and the suppression of the human spirit." The Committee asked for assurances regarding the future trend of British imperialism. Throughout the country the demand became strong that His Majesty's Government should give an assurance as to India's post-war status. The resolution adopted by the Muslim League showed the suspicion felt by Muslims towards the growing power and prestige of the Congress. While the League professed to stand for the freedom of India, it asked an assurance from Britain that no declaration regarding constitutional advance for India should be made without the consent and the approval of the League and that no constitution should be framed or approved without that

consent. This was a direct challenge to the Congress demand for a declaration from the British Government. The unhelpful attitude of the League was encouraged by persons like Sir Maurice Gwyer, who said "Britain warned by the past distractions of India and the melancholy spectacle of Europe to-day seeks to discern the concordat which will be the sign for relinquishing a government so long held in trust." The concordat would have emerged if Britain had refused to be a party to the Muslim League's attempt to hold the majority to ransom under the pretence that it is the only spokesman of the minorities. At the general elections, only 108 out of the 482 Muslim seats were secured by the League nominees and the Congress cannot throw overboard the Pathans, the Shias, the Nationalist Muslims and the many other sections who repudiate the League.

Gandhi stressed the need for an assurance from Great Britain that all the dependencies under the Crown should be granted the fullest political freedom, and saw no difficulty in giving immediate practical effect to such a declaration which would imply war collaboration in terms of equality between Indians and the British. The British Government asserted that Indians should compose their internal differences and produce the condition which makes Dominion Status inevitable. The Congress asked for a declaration of the independence of India which would leave Indians to settle their domestic differences by themselves. The League has no faith in legal safeguards or pledges or parties to secure respect for minority rights. It is moving more and more towards separatism and the creation of a Muslim Ulster as a means of protecting Muslim interests. The Hindu Mahasabha represents the orthodox school of Hindu traditions and was one with it in denouncing the League for disrupting the unity of India.

The August Offer did not promote the prospect of a solution of the political deadlock. It definitely worsened a situation which was bad enough in all conscience. The Congress wanted a National Government, that would be responsible, in fact if not in law, to the legislature. Mr. Amery said that Britain could not agree to it because "it is a demand which really raises the whole unresolved constitutional issue and prejudices it in the sense favoured by the Congress and rejected by the minorities." "There can be no agreement" he added, "on a

government responsible to the legislature until there is agreement upon the nature of the legislature and upon the whole structure of the constitution."

Why should Mr. Amery suppose that the introduction of the principle of executive responsibility would be pernicious in the Centre? Mr. Jinnah and his extremists may repudiate democracy as rule by a Hindu caucus but there is no evidence whatever that the minorities as a whole are opposed to it. To the parrot-like plea that Parliamentary Government would mean majority-domination, Gandhi's reply is unanswerable. "The content of the latter (independence) will be decided, not by Congress, but by the vote of all. And if it is to be achieved non-violently, it follows that the mere vote of the majority will have little play. The Charter of Independence must be the product of the willing consent of the minorities and other relevant interests which are not in conflict with the interests of the vast mass of Indian humanity." The Congress stands for a constitution based on the independence, the integrity and the consent of the minorities. But Mr. Amery's statement nowhere declared that the Government would not allow perverse or wilful opposition on the part of any minority or minorities to hold up constitutional advance.¹

British statesmen taking refuge from their consciences in the excuse of disunity among Indian political parties provoked *The Daily Herald* to comment "for Britain to dodge her responsibilities while retaining her rule is Pharasaic and contemptible evasion." A contented India, it argued, would deprive Britain's enemies of a rich subject for sneering propaganda. The present conflict is said to be waged for justice and to establish the freedom of peoples. But Britain's shield was tarnished by her present relationship with India. To say that Indians would be admitted within a measurable time to full partnership and nationhood showed distrust. It sounded a timely warning that nothing could more easily deal with the Indian dispute than a generous gesture from Britain.

The basic cause of the deadlock was in the contrasting approaches made by the Congress and the British Government towards the independence issue. It was the Government's

¹ "To hark back upon the government statement of August, 1940, which met with a chorus of disapproval in India, and at the same time placing the onus of agreement on the Indian political groups, alas! reflects the chronic blind spot in the British mental outlook, an apparent incapacity to distinguish between the things of Martha and the things of Mary". W. Horstall Carter, "Partnership With India", *The Fortnightly*, April, 1942.

rejection of the Poona Offer that made the Congress despair of arriving at any kind of settlement with the Government and ultimately lead to the launching of Satyagraha. Gandhi while dissociating from that Offer, yet earnestly advised Britain to accept it, thus that conceding that as a political organisation the Congress was perfectly justified in concentrating on constructive ends. The Congress again voluntarily solicited Gandhi's lead. Since numbers did not affect the validity of Civil-Disobedience as a moral force, Gandhi planned "individual" Satyagraha. To Gandhi this war is a terrible illustration of the moral issues that are at the root of all conflict. He declared "I believe more in the efficacy of the incalculable force of an inscrutable Divinity than in the efficacy of the calculated and calculable force that the combined powers of destruction can bring into play on this little planet. That incalculable force somehow or other has to act through human agency. How and when, I cannot say. I proceed upon the faith that to-day the Congress is the only organisation, however imperfect, however wanting in faith as an organisation, still the only organisation that stands defiantly for peaceful measures." Gandhi pointed out that the movement was a grand protest against the conduct of the war in the name of a free people. "It is a token of the yearning of a political organisation to achieve the freedom of 350 million people through purely non-violent effort and, therefore, to affect the future destiny of the world."

The limp and the shoulder-shrugging resignation of the British bureaucracy was considered intolerable by all progressive sections in Britain itself. In his speeches in the House of Commons, Mr. Amery reverted to his favourite point that the issue in India was not between Britain and India but between Indians and Indians. Phrases like "Britain's historical and other obligations," "agreement between the principal elements of India's national life," "insuperable objections of minorities" annoyed some thoughtful Englishmen. Mr. Ammon pointed out that the talk of "free and equal partnership" amounted to little or nothing unless there was a clear definition of India's post-war status, including a declaration that within a brief specific period after the war, India was to enjoy the same freedom as Britain and the Dominions.

When Mr. Amery once again resumed his play on the worn-wicket of August Offer *vs.* Independence, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru felt bored and said "I am not interested in the repeated

performances of Mr. Amery on the public stage repeating the same thing *ad nauseam*. My only answer to him and to the British government is in the words of Oliver Cromwell quoted by Mr. Amery in the House of Commons "We have had enough of you, get out!"

The expansion of the Viceroy's Executive Council announced on July 21, 1941 was just display and window-dressing, irrelevant to the realities of the lamentable situation in India. *The New Statesman* wrote that the reality of the crisis in India would make even an imperial angel weep.¹ If it were not for India, three-quarters of the human race would have proclaimed the cause of Britain as just and its heart clean. The journal observed "as long as Nehru and the other Congressmen are in gaol, the cause is compromised and the cleanliness spotted." It felt that at intervals Britain should repeat the folly of George III and North was exasperating. Britain had learnt little from her 170 years imperial experience. Periodically she became blind to her imperial memory. She did it in America, in Egypt, in Ireland and now in India. The right to self-government was a part of British tradition. With heroic and stubborn stupidity the patriotic Tory imperialist might deny it. Then he only prefers the way for imperial disruption. It should be conceded before the concession is useless. Power must be transferred from the British hands into those of an Indian democracy. To hide behind the difficulty of minority problem will make the disaster only certain.

Politically-minded Indians contended that the genuineness of the Atlantic Charter would be tested by the manner in which its principles were applied to India. Consequently there was profound disappointment with Mr. Churchill's interpretation of the Charter in relation to India. The Prime Minister said that it did not in any way qualify the various statements made from time to time about the development of constitutional government in India, Burma and other parts of the Commonwealth. He reiterated that the British government was pledged by the declaration of 1940 to help India obtain free and equal partnership in the Commonwealth, subject to the fulfilment of the obligations arising from the long British connection with India and British responsibility to many creeds, races, and interests in the country. He regarded the re-establishment of

¹ *The New Statesman*, August 9, 1941, (leading article).

European sovereignties, ruthlessly destroyed by aggression as quite a separate problem from the progressive evolution of self-governing institutions in regions whose peoples own allegiance to the British Crown. Even Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru said that his statement produced a depressing effect on the Indian mind. The government received a rebuff from those on whom they fawned. The substantive part of the pledge was always qualified by something that followed, which in its application was susceptible of a great deal of mischief. The world "obligation" if left undefined and the pledge is circumscribed by cautious reservations. The Charter only convinced Mr. Savarkar that politics is about power and all nations are selfish to the core. In truth, Mr. Churchill had vigorously opposed even the small instalments of reforms of the 1935 Act. The Rt. Hon'ble V. S. Srinivasa Sastri styling Mr. Churchill as one of "the twin saviours" of civilization said "Is there means of arraigning him and those for whom he speaks before the bar of world opinion? I have felt sorely that the triple combination of the Prime Minister, the Secretary of State and the Viceroy brings disaster to Indian hopes." The Charter was not a private document but a compensatory award for the goodwill and assistance given by the world.

Sir Stafford Cripps brought a Draft Declaration with the hope that it might win "a remarkable and practical measure of acceptance." The proposals had the united endorsement of the British War Cabinet. The talks were carried out in a spirit of goodwill and the Congress made an obviously sincere attempt at finding a solution. There was a deep-rooted feeling that Cripps would find a just and final settlement. At the moment of triumph Sir Stafford felt the humiliation of defeat and the greatest single reason for it was that the Viceroy was more inventive in devices to wreck the negotiations.¹ The Government of India, obsessed with the desire to retain its

¹ "Indians wanted a real national government. Cripps had agreed. But subsequently 'British Views' prevailed, and Cripps changed his tone and told Congress leaders the matter was no longer in his hands and they would have to discuss it with the Viceroy. Something had happened behind the scenes. As one American General who was in New Delhi during the Cripps negotiations said to me "Cripps was bitched in the back". "Cripps told a deputation of British businessmen in India that their long day in India was done and that in the future free India they could not enjoy special privileges. These British businessmen protested to British officials in New Delhi and by cable to Winston Churchill. The Princes likewise stormed British officials in India and elsewhere refused to countenance a real national government. All these forces pulled wires and brought their influence to bear against Sir Stafford's success". Louis Fischer in *Nation*, September 19, 1942.

Also see the articles "The Cripps Mission viewed from England", "The Cripps Mission Viewed from India". *The Round Table*, June, 1942. Sir Frederick Whyte "Sir Stafford Cripps in India", *The Fortnightly*, May, 1942. The prevailing trend of British opinion on the failure of the Cripps Mission is summed up in this line "Cripps would have carried the day if there had been any real disposition in all parties to approach the problem free from the freezing effect of past commitments, feuds and preconceptions. It was the dead hand of an evil inheritance from days gone by that strangled Sir Stafford's hopes".

unchecked autocracy forgot that a settlement with the Congress was of paramount importance to its own cause, and repeatedly followed courses which were bound to lead to disaster.

At the end of the hostilities, the Cripps formula promised a "constitution-making" body, elected through the system of proportional representation, by the Lower Houses of provincial legislatures acting collectively. The states would be invited to appoint representatives. With this body the British government would negotiate a treaty. The constitution would provide for an Indian Union, but any province which was unwilling to join would be entitled to remain outside and to receive separate treatment with the same rights as the Union. Dominion Status with the right of secession was conceded. The status of the Union was defined in the explicit terms of the Balfour Declaration. The position and mutual relation of the Dominions, according to the Balfour Declaration is that "They are autonomous communities within the British Empire, equal in status, in no way subordinate one to another in any aspect of their domestic or external affairs, though united by a common allegiance to the Crown, and freely associated as members of the British Commonwealth of Nations."

Meanwhile, for handling the crucial problems of defence policy and organisation, the responsibilities of British and Indian governments must remain unchanged. But the co-operation of all sections was invited in terms which foreshadowed the probability of adjustments within the executive council. The Government of India has made its business to play upon the fears of minorities and the cupidity of vested interests, which are ever prepared to sacrifice national ends for their own advantage. The Muslim League is the Indian Ulster, and its intransigence is chiefly due to the British handling of the problem. The Muslim League's claim for separate nation-hood was characterized by Cripps himself in 1940 as an "emotional grievance." It is common-place that in the post-war period no nation can hope to preserve its integrity without self-sufficiency in the spheres of economics and defence.

The Muslim League objected that the Scheme in its aims and methods cut across its claim. The Congress admitted that a unit could not be compelled to remain within an Indian Union, but it insisted that no radical change should be made which might hinder the growth of a strong national state. It also

demanding that the right to appoint state delegates to the constitution-making body should be taken away from the Princes and given to the people. The Congress asked that a representative Indian should be appointed to the Viceroy's Council in the capacity of the Defence Member, side by side with the Commander-in-Chief, who at present holds the portfolio of defence. The Congress demanded that the Executive Council should be transformed into a Cabinet Government with full powers. Regarding the interim arrangements the Congress reply reiterated the Declaration as vague and incomplete implying no vital changes in the existing governmental structure.

The demand of the Congress, it is argued, reflects its leanings towards autocratic leadership. Its acceptance would make the Muslim case go by default and the states would be brushed aside. Therefore no agreement could be registered. The twice-inflated Executive Council, a museum of minorities, has been singularly unsuccessful in either maximising the war effort or winning popular support.

A free and independent India will influence the future of the war, the spirit in which it will be waged on all fronts and the reply democracies can give to the challenge made by the revolutionary philosophy of National Socialism.¹ And it will also determine how capable United Nations shall be at the end of the war to reconstruct the world on a just and durable basis. To cling to privilege and exploitation at such a time is to become an ally of Hitler. The German propaganda will create in the minds of the enslaved people an idea that they have not much to lose and everything to gain. This propaganda which atrophies the will to resist, cannot be met simply by a mad-dog hatred of the Congress. *The Daily Herald* wrote² that to negotiate with the Congress is as good as attempting to reason with Laval. Evidently it forgot the fantastic spectacle of British statesmen, who were later to call on their countrymen to go and fight "the forces of evil," adulating these small evil men, Laval, Mussolini and Company for years. If the Red-spots-in-the-vision had not potently clouded their understanding

1 "Mr. Gandhi is venerated in the United States as no man on this earth has been venerated since Tolstoy died..... On the day that we can bring Mr. Gandhi to the microphone to broadcast his faith in our intention to grant national self-government to India, we shall have won our title to liberate the Continent at our door". H. N. Brailsford, *America, Our Ally*, p. 116, 1940.

2 *The Daily Mail*, (Leading article), September, 11 1942. *The Hindu* of September 12, 1942, recorded "It is clear that Mr. Churchill's experience as Premier during the gravest crisis that has yet confronted his country has not improved him in any way; that so far as India is concerned he is as dangerously irresponsible, as arrogantly contemptuous and as purblind as ever."

they would have made a firm alliance with Russia, a thing which Mr. Churchill always avoided like a pest, and this war would never have occurred.

The broad masses in India must be convinced that democracy has a definite meaning and a continuing significance for them. The present Executive Council of the Viceroy is altogether unsuitable for the organisational demands of a total war, in which the whole man-power and wealth of the community must be mobilised. The Viceroy has only promoted to the highest places the safe men with no ideas, no initiative and no outlasting influence. These timid Councillors are in office but not in power. If the United Nations are to win this war they must carry through a political revolution that will bring to all men and women in the dependencies the conviction of an equal comradeship. India demands the right to make its own muddle in its own way.

Even Mr. Amery in his brief lucid moments has admitted that he realises "how much over the last two generations India has owed to the national movement of which the Congress party has been the chief exponent." He further acknowledges "Indeed one might say that today the ideals which the Congress had advocated over all these years for India are the ideals for India which we ourselves share." This conversion the Congress would never have brought about if it had aimed at a party ascendancy or totalitarian dictatorship.

The Congress in a resolution passed by the A.I.C.C. in August 1942 demanded the withdrawal of the British power as to enable India effectively to become an ally of the United Nations, and to fight the aggressors. The resolution declared that "the immediate ending of the British rule in India, is an urgent necessity both for the sake of India and for the success of the cause of the United Nations. The continuation of that rule is degrading and enfeebling India, and making her progressively less capable of defending herself, and of contributing to the cause of world freedom." Professor Harold Laski¹ has

1 "But I say with all the emphasis I can that no party in Great Britain has as yet genuinely sought a full accommodation with India; that every offer made has been accompanied with reservations and restrictions the purpose of which has always been to keep the keys of Indian power in London; that this policy, sooner or later, will lead to catastrophe in India and that this catastrophe will reflect; so grievously upon our international standing as to destroy our power of effective leadership in Europe. A free India in voluntary association with the British Commonwealth of Nations would immensely strengthen us both in the war itself and in the years of peace beyond. A sullen India, governed by repressive ordinances, the lathi and the concentration camp, an India in which we sentence Nehru to rigorous imprisonment, is a grim denial of our claim to fight for liberty and democracy. For it is not easy to distinguish the characteristics of British rule in India at least in their essentials, from

pointed out that there is no difficulty either about fixing a date for Britain's relinquishing her control or constituting a convention to work out the form of government for India. A true democracy based on economic equality is impossible in any part of the empire so long as the four-hundred millions of Indians are denied freedom. Mr. Francis Williams says that India has been promised adult freedom so long that the taste has grown sour in her mouth.

As early as 1933, Jawaharlal Nehru wrote in *The Daily Herald*, "The struggle for Indian freedom is essentially a part of the world struggle for the emancipation of the exploited everywhere and for the establishment of a new social order." The Congress is not founded on negations nor has it enlisted, as *The Daily Telegraph* has charged "the help of Japanese fifth-columnists."¹ It is a comprehensive Indian national movement founded upon positive ideals. Democratic institutions are its life-blood. Free co-operation is its instrument. Non-violence, Universalism and Peace are its remedies for the maladies of western civilization.

those of Nazi rule in Czechoslovakia. It is lamentable that it should be so." H. J. Laski, *Programme for Victory*, p. 22, 1941.

Mr. Wendell Willkie in a broadcast address said "When Indian aspirations for freedom were put aside to some future and unspecified and unguaranteed date, it was not Britain but the United States that suffered in the public esteem in the Far East. The people of the East who would like to count on us are doubtful. They cannot ascertain from our government's wishy-washy attitude towards the problem of India what we are likely to feel at the end of the war about the hundreds of millions of the Eastern people." (*The Hindu*, November 4, 1942.)

1 "It is sheer non-sense to talk of Gandhi as a "Fifth-Columnist"..... That Mr. Gandhi is a great patriot, a great man and a great spiritual leader, who can doubt?" General Smuts, *The Hindu*, November 15, 1942.

3. MALADY OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION

FALSE SENSE OF VALUES

CULTURES AND CIVILIZATIONS of the world have differed in their nature and emphasis, apart from the conditioning physical environment because of a dominating "destiny-idea." This "idea" is a specific and essential attribute of that particular type of humanity. It is a complex of an indivisible kind, freighted with spirituality and dynamic force. The inner being of the man is conditioned by this absolute idea. That is why, man is pledged to concepts like freedom, truth and non-violence. Culture is founded upon the humanly timeless aspects of Dharma, upon the limitless powers of self-renewal which it its consequence and upon ever-fresh and potential youthfulness, which is nourished by the Absolute.

Indian culture throughout the historical times bears evidence to the fact that it was inspired by feeling and consciousness of the dignity of man. It had its deep and indestructible roots in Dharma. The Ideal of Duty was thought out, but it was thought out in relation to life and action. In a specifically modern sense the border-line between thought and deed had faded away and coalesced in the sacredness of personality.

The expounders of Kultur on the other hand said that the people have "rabbit horizon", they are "weak philistines" and they need "bread and circuses." Such a conception of man is morally spurious. It is small wonder that the lamps of civilization are dimmed in Europe. And it behoves us to revive and spread that light into those dark parlours, where millions are witnessing the death-shudder of an expiring epoch.

The quest for peace is a human quest of deep ethical significance, for enduring values. War is an immature escape from the urgent problems of a civilization in conflict. It is a

cians. But they should know that reasonableness as a social value is imbedded in a developing civilization.

It is vital to remember that popular education, tolerance, free speech and freedom of association are the gains of civilized living and they can never be mere static values. The supreme need is not to preserve them in their present condition but to vitalize them in response to changing needs and opportunities.

The loss of an appreciation of the ethical values in the west has resulted in a loss of a sense of values and this has varied with individual and national character. To say that moral values are static is the most impudent perversion of reality. On the other hand in their essential spirit they are cumulative. The radicals might feel indignant when we state barely that any proposed change must be within limits and compatible with the elasticity of the current social morality. This does not mean that we should compromise with that morality as it is, but transform it without torpedoing its principles of life. Such an attitude will guarantee a continual social growth and not simply tear up society by the roots. It is true that any attempt to refashion the social garment will be stoutly resisted, even where morality puts in no word of veto. But resistance will be formidable where fear of change is reinforced by moral taboo.

The advocates of social change must learn to differentiate between true and false social morality. The sovereign quality of a true moral idea is its capacity for growth and adaptation to the prevailing conditions without losing its essential character, whereas induced moral ideas have a static quality and an ossification about them.

In the capitalist societies many forms of conduct which help to preserve their institutions and mode of life are inculcated as "moral." The Soviet Union is a remarkable example of a well-knit political unit not based throughout on a common culture pattern or a common moral tradition. This plastic quality will doubtless enable her to serve as a bridge or interpreter between the cultures of East and West. Thus it offers to the world the brightest hope of a durable peace.

In any scientific plan for world reconstruction, three elements must be present; definition of the end to be achieved, examination of the conditioning facts; and the mode of proce-

ture by which it is proposed to pass from the facts to the end. Such a conception necessarily implies that we must be able to identify science with optimistic philosophy. Those who desire to take a conscious part in the process of social transformation must revise their ideals in the light of science and human history. Then the ideal should not be regarded as an end-term to a process of historic evolution but as a purpose to reach it.

A revision of our traditional views is made possible only by scientific education. It will result as Trotsky said in the awakening of the human personality in the masses. It is only historical reactionaries that will oppose a new experimental and scientific movement towards a freer and more just society. There can be no truce between a civilized community and the tyrant's concentration camp. The concept of human freedom, with its corollaries, social justice and equality of opportunity should form the axis of the motive-pattern of all who attempt a transvaluation of values.

The world that our effort and sacrifice may create must be a far better-educated world. Now we witness the spectacle of man wasting his own possibilities. The impulses of his real self are imprisoned in the iron chest of customs, fashions and taboos. As Mr. H. G. Wells observes from end to end of the earth, and down the whole corridor of recorded history, man has been made.¹ But it was a planless process. Now the revision of the conception of our existence in terms of biological science is imperative to a much more complete and systematic making of the man. The made human being of the days to come will have acquired the habit of self-control and tempering its innate self-assertion.

Educational pressure should be exercised to turn out neither a meek believing citizen nor a self-conscious egotist. It should choose the middle-way, between crippled impulses and undisciplined release. The educational organisation of the New World must plan its human material for the development of a sense of disinterested mastery as the chief motive. Such citizens will have infinitely better-ordered brains than the contemporaries. They will have to operate in a world of "fatuous and entangling situations, faded loyalties and practical imperatives, ruled by the phantoms and terrors of the past."

¹ H. G. Wells, *Guide to the New World: A Handbook of Constructive World Revolution*, p. 144. 1941.

In this world of realised possibilities there will be little scope for either morbid excesses or morbid continence. Everyone in the measure of his capacity will be a seeker after truth. There will be little need for the commercialization of discoveries. According to H. G. Wells, in such a more rational world the universal religion will be philosophy, and all men will be seekers. The human race will live in an eternal dawn that will never lose its freshness in the weariness of the day.

To meet the conditions created by this total war, a world revolution will be necessary. Some argue that it should be a pragmatic revolution, one that evolves its policy as it goes on, tied to no predetermined scheme of institution but seeking its ends by any and every compatible means. Its aim will be to obtain efficient leadership without the sacrifice of liberty. The new state mechanism will not primarily be a matter of machinery, but of the prevailing conception of society appropriate to it. But these proposals are open to criticism for their implications seem to have been ignored. Pliable opportunism is confounded with pragmatism. Therefore, such an idea of pragmatic revolution will be remote from any achieved reality.

The deterioration of the political values in the west is but a corollary to the loss of ethical ideals. Therefore, reactionary nationalism of privilege will play a greater role in the coming struggle for the liberation of Europe. The exiled governments now domiciled in Great Britain will surely demand the restoration of the states which they still purport to represent. Secondly, revolutionary movements in the Nazi occupied regions will tend to take a strongly nationalistic form. Thirdly, the brave bombastic speeches of Mr. Churchill promising to restore even the weak states of Europe with a totalitarian bias, are a potential danger mortgaging the future even if they are war propaganda. Therefore, it is necessary to rid nationalism of its reaction and to endow it with its revolutionary democratic character. To cling to the pre-war order of nation-states with frontiers drawn so as to cut right-across the natural units of production and exchange will endanger any type of international unity that can be fashioned from the victory of the democratic powers. So dire are the fruits of European atomism that some despairingly feel that unification under the Nazis might be better than unification at all. The plain and significant truth is that only delusion and danger have come

from the doting fondness of the peace-makers of 1919 for the ideal of self-determination.

Self-determination has fallen on evil days because it is preserved in the nineteenth century setting of political rights and has failed to adapt itself to the twentieth century context of military and economic problems. It may be defined as a process by which a group of people of reasonable size desirous of constituting a state should be allowed to form a state. It follows that the state is the unit of political power and the nation is a community of men. Hence the state is artificial or conventional while the nation is natural or organic. A nation like the state grows or decays by a process which is independent of any conscious act of the human will. Professor E. H. Carr contends that once nationality is recognised as an objective quality, there is always a potential incongruity between it and self-determination.¹

Let us be clear upon the essential significance of the doctrine of self-determination. It is untrue to say that self-determination is a right of individual men and women which includes limited rights to form national groups. The idea of an absolute right of self-determination is a mere rhetorical phrase devoid of practical meaning. Even Russia raised this slogan when it served her purpose and has evolved the multi-national state bound together by a tie of loyalty independent of and opposed to national feeling. Hitlerite Germany having used it as an instrument to tear up the Versailles Treaty has severely restricted its application in the territories that have fallen under her sway. The totalitarian character of modern warfare has rendered neutrality, however passive in character as rarely neutral in effect. The small neutral states can only survive by hanging on to the skirts of a Great Power.

Therefore, the conditions of the new age demand a redefinition of the concept of self-determination. It will not hasten disintegration if it is not confounded with the principle of nationality. The small nation markets, small nation cultures and small political structures are a restriction on a larger freedom. The nineteenth century assumption that "nation" and "state" should coincide, must be forthwith discarded. Emphasis should be laid on the necessary limitations of this doctrine. This right should carry with it the correlative obligation to subordinate

¹ E. H. Carr, *The Future of Nations*, p. 18, 1941.

military and economic policy to the needs of a wider community. The divorce between "cultural nation" and "state nation" should mean that people should determine themselves into different groups for different purposes. This system of divided but not incompatible loyalties is the only workable solution. The small nations must be convinced that self-determination cannot be a reality unless it is combined with mutual aid and that independence is conditioned by interdependence.

The future international obligations should be evolved in two directions; a larger unit than the present nation for military and economic purposes and within the penumbra of this unit, for the largest measure of devolution for other purposes. Thus the foundations for international interdependence and co-operation should be extended to other countries by an empirical process, avoiding doctrinaire rigidity, on the basis of the power available to make co-operation effective. The New Order can only be built on such a net-work of understandings, flexible in its essential nature and inspired by no undue itch for uniformity. Later on a legal shape can be given to it.

The problem is to reconcile nationalism with the requirements of the international order. Nationalists everywhere insist on their linguistic aspirations, value of the national history and traditions and the right to follow the traditional religion of the nation. The equal right to hold all shades of opinion not directly excluded by the basic conditions of civilization, rank among the absolute conditions of democracy. Then equality should be conceived positively as equal responsibilities and equal rights. This calls for the interpretation of democracy in an active sense. A vigorous tradition of free association for a wide range of social ends must be fostered. This associative spirit is the kernel of democracy.

Nationalism as a basis for the state can survive only in its perverted imperialist form. It is equally true that the imperialism of theory is the practice of the nationalist age—an inverted nationalism. The theory of economic imperialism is a European one, formulated by Karl Marx and developed by Lenin. Socialism as an ideal was and is international. Socialism as a political force has always had to function within the frame-work of the nation-state. Further, trade unionism everywhere has been forced into the mould of economic nationalism.

As in the political sphere, in the domain of economics we find the same perverted sense of values. The action of nation-state under labour pressure is limiting the free inter-play of economic forces, protective legislation in favour of the wage-earner, the safeguarding of national industries, the system of tariff walls and subsidies, all this which brought about the steady eclipse of economic and political liberalism, has closely identified the cause of labour today with the cause of nationalism. However, nationalism of the old type is becoming extinct in Europe.

The mistakes and selfishness of governments like Britain, Holland, Belgium and Portugal in their large and distant colonial empires are responsible for their backwardness. The evils cannot be mitigated by "Internationalisation." The question of colonial freedom will be permanently postponed if the colonies are ruled by a combination of stronger peoples than by one. There is every chance of the international committee developing into a mere economic cartel. Some argue that the Mandate System should be universalized forgetting that the Mandate idea itself is a hang-over from the age of *laissez faire*. There is need and opportunity for international action, distinct from Internationalisation. In the New Order, international co-operation must take its positive and constructive part in the stupendous work of colonial development and help to pay for it.¹

The economic determination of politics is a reality, but another fact, no less stubborn and real, is the political determination of economics. The significant choice between guns and butter which dominated the years before the war was a political and not an economic choice. Therefore, it is not enough if the peace-makers busy themselves with the economic rehabilitation of the world during the transition period. They cannot simply let politics look after itself. Undoubtedly, if the political passions are not effectively controlled and directed then they will produce the same witch's cauldron of hatred, fear and war.

There is no possible way of ending the present strife until a workable formula is evolved for the problems of raw material and living space. According to Dr. Herman Kranold² the *per capita* wealth of the fifteen principal nations, range from the

1 W. M. Macmillan, *Democratise the Empire*, pp. 40-64, 1941.

2 Herman Kranold, *The International Distribution of Raw Materials*, 1938.

highest to the lowest as follows : Canada, Australia, Union of South Africa, United States, Russia, Great Britain, Germany, Italy, Brazil, Holland, Japan, France, Poland, India and China. The *per capita* method of calculation is unsatisfactory in comparing the total wealth of the nations concerned. Still it has a certain validity. The composition of the unfavoured group turns out to be quite different from what we hear so often stated, that Germany, Italy and Japan are those unhappy nations which need a redistribution of raw materials in their favour.

A rationalization in the distribution of raw materials and a recognition of the political, financial and psychological hazards which stand in the way of a fair adjustment are necessary. Three factors govern the conditions determining the quantity of raw materials a nation can buy (1) the content of purchasing power, (2) the price at which the material can be bought and (3) the competition of wants for a limited amount of purchasing power at the disposal of a nation. In the past the problem of requiring needed raw materials was rendered difficult not only by trade restrictions and price-control, but partly through the collapse of a normal system of international exchange. Therefore, any solution of the raw materials problem must take into account the necessity of making more easily available natural resources, which the artificiality of political boundaries and nationalist economic system restrict.

The question of "Living-space" came to the fore in Herr Hitler's reply to President Roosevelt's Peace Message stated on April 28, 1939, in the Reichstag: "According to all common-sense, logic and all principles of a general human and higher justice, nay, even according to the laws of a Divine will, all nations ought to have an equal share in the goods of this world. It should thus not happen that one nation claims so much living-space that it cannot get along when there are not even 15 inhabitants to the square kilometre, while other nations are forced to maintain 140, 150 or 200 in the same area. But in no case these fortunate nations should further curtail the living-space of those peoples who are already suffering by robbing them, for example of their colonies."

According to Hitler's professions, all nations ought to have an equal share in the area of the world. Even if living-space is measured by relating the population to the area of the mother country and all dependencies combined, still the shares of the

various nations differ enormously. The German Empire comprises 0.5 per cent. of the world area but 4.0 of the world population. The corresponding shares of Poland are 0.3 and 1.6 per cent. and of Japan 1.5 and 6.4 per cent. Other Have-nots are China, Holland, Spain and Turkey. The British Empire with 26 per cent. of the world area and 24.6 per cent. of the world population, has a big slice and so has the United States. Italy had more than the average living-space.

Professor Obst characterizes as "excessive" the living-space of the British, the Belgian, the Portuguese and the Russian Empires, and of Brazil as "sufficient," the living-space of the United States as "more than sufficient." The living-space of the Italian Empire "at least sufficient" and "as barely sufficient" the living-space of Poland and China.

If the German Government were to contend that their population is too dense to the area over which they have control, then few can dispute the validity of such a claim. But in Germany the uncovered demand for labour was estimated at one million. Italy in order to increase her importance in Europe is aiming at an increase of her population so as to create through her demographic expansion the basis for the territorial expansion. Sr. Gayda wrote in *Giornale d' Italia*, August 25, 1942, that what Italy hopes to achieve after successful war, was freedom of Mediterranean, free access to all oceans, fertile colonial territories, empire in East Africa, all territory in North Africa formerly belonging to Turkey and fraudulently taken by France, territory up to the Atlantic, Lake Chad and surrounding territory upto the coast, Nigeria, Corsica, Dalmatia and dismantling of Gibraltar and Suez. We can understand when Mussolini says Italy must have at least 60,000,000 inhabitants in a decade or two. For the fundamental fact which conditions the political and hence the economic and moral power of nations is their demographic power.

Italy has adopted various measures to increase the births. She has discouraged celibacy, encouraged the raising of large families by taxing bachelors and married couple with no or few children, by granting tax reductions or exemptions to workers with at least eight children and by presenting a medal of honour to all mothers with numerous children. Marriage premiums, birth premiums, family allowances and a wide range of services for the protection of mothers and children are

provided. The sanction of marriage loans on a large scale by Germany has affected population trends there. The loans, which at the maximum 1,000 marks, are given in the form of coupons and may be exchanged at shops for certain kinds of household goods. The loan is interest-free and it should be repayed at the rate of one per cent. per month. A quarter of the initial loan is cancelled with the birth of each child. In 1934, the assisted marriages numbered 224,169. The total number of marriage loans granted from August, 1933 to March, 1939 was 1,20,654.

Dr. Goebbels says "It is a pity that western powers conduct an ostrich policy in the matter of colonies. Do they think that fifty years hence when the 80,000,000 Germans will be 130,000,000, the earth can remain distributed as at present?" The rhetorical statement of the doctor cannot hide the fact that Germany is not over-crowded. In point of fact, she has restricted, "Aryan" emigration and recruits labourers from her new territories. The principal and economic argument for the return of her colonies is that Germany would have the much needed access to tropical products. In a coming planned distribution of world space her claims cannot be ignored.

In conformity with this deterioration of ethical, political and economic values, Europe has lost its appreciation of culture and aesthetic values. Giovanni Gentile said "spiritual activity only works in the plenitude of freedom." Culture has always developed as an infinitely slow but sure refinement and elaboration of simple things. And it is absurd to talk about a democratic culture until we are in fact a democracy.

Culture is not an affair of crude calculation, or power and purpose, but of the spirit, of genius. It is something wider and something more intangible than art and it is difficult to catch it on the move. The vital difference between the true and false conception of culture is a difference of Feeling. It can be regarded as something originating in separate individuals or as something deriving from the collective entity of the nation. Herr Hitler is full of contempt for art which claims to be of an age rather than of a race. Art for him is the very test and proof of nation-hood. As a nation grows to self-awareness and to power, so there comes into being an art which is of that nation, peculiar to that nation, a direct expression of its being and ethos. Therefore, Hitler has enforced a national standard

of art and has created an organisation to see that the standards are adopted and observed by all artists, writers and composers within the Reich. Herbert Read says that this is not merely the expression of empty life, of cold mute conflict, when not barbarous it is vulgar and sentimental, and never once lifts itself into those regions of radiance and joy and fantasy to which all true works of art belong.¹ The uniform dullness and deadness is the result of subordinating the artist to political control.

Art, according to the Nazi theory, is a sort of reward for national self-sufficiency, and it will blossom when that state of self-sufficiency is securely established.² But artistic creation is the result of a very delicate psychology balance of forces within the individual mind. The creative spirit of the artist obeys laws which we cannot discern. Therefore, there is no vital connection between culture and collectivism. The hand of the state is a dead hand which paralyses every manifestation of the human spirit.

The symptom of the disease of our civilization is seen in the horrible distinction between arts and the art of living. When we are least conscious of our culture we will have more of it. Then according to William Morris, culture must become identical with the pleasure of life. The people must be brought to culture. This can be realised only by a long process of education which will be an integral part of the coming social revolution.

When we repeat with Eric Gill "To Hell with Culture" we mean to hell with "all forms of culture, ancient or modern, genuine or ersatz."³ But a culture of pots and pans should not be despised as it mirrors the civilizations of the past. However, culture to acquire social relevance must express the immediate hopes and aspirations of humanity.

The perversion of religious values in Europe has reached its climax under war conditions. The high-brows in the west are occupied with planning for a world of peace. But devout Christians are worried when they feel that the essence of Christianity is to be found in Mathew V. "But I say unto you that ye resist not evil." Christians can do one or two things about this injunction; obey it to the letter, or disobey it in the

¹ See Ch. "Culture and Liberty" Herbert Read in *Programme for Victory*, 1941.

² "Hitler does at any rate realise the importance of art, which is more than any British government has ever done", (p. 67).

³ Herbert Read, *To Hell with Culture*, p. 14.

conviction that acceptance and non-resistance have not the same connotation in all circumstances. They argue that in the great historical crisis the choice is not between good and evil but a greater and lesser evil. Hence, to take the sword against aggression is better than submission to the evil aggression brings.

But as Rousseau said "the country of the true Christian is not of the world" and he added that the true Christian's reaction to national decadence would be "to bless the hand of God that is hard upon his people." Lord Elton argues¹ that "the business of Christians is not to denounce the social evilnot commit themselves in detail to any one particular remedy." This militant Christianity of the noble Lord seems the wrong way to preach the Gospel. But a cynic might sneeringly say that St. George, after all, is something of an apocryphal character.

Belief in God and faith in religion have suffused Gandhi's ideas with a power and love we feel. Says Gandhi "I want to identify myself with everything that lives. In the language of the Gita, I want to live at peace with both friend and foe. So my patriotism for me is a stage in my journey to the land of eternal freedom and peace. Thus it will be seen that for me there are no politics devoid of religion. They subserve religion. Politics bereft of religion are a death-trap because they kill the soul."² To him there is no God than Truth and the only means of realisation of Truth is love or Ahimsa. The highest religious quality is enshrined in perfect compassion towards erring humanity. Therefore, Gandhi can only understand political concepts in terms of social realities. He rightly believes that a prostrate India can give no hope to the human race; only an awakened, independent India can give comfort to a groaning world. The principle of satyagraha is rooted in the creative power of the soul. Gandhi observes "If I hit my adversary, that is of course violence; but to be truly non-violent, I must love him and pray for him even if he hits me."

Gandhi's unique contribution to civilization is that our conflicts can be settled by goodwill and understanding. The application of human qualities like love, tolerance and self-discipline on the cosmic plane as a plan for social and political

¹ Lord Elton, *St. George or the Dragon : Towards a Christian Democracy*, 1942.

² C. F. Andrews, *Mahatma Gandhi—His Own Story*, p. 358.

liberation is the greatest constructive achievement in the epic of Man. The ethics of Christ is the ethics of Gandhi. It is grotesque to reconcile Christianity with mass butchery. Gandhi confesses "Most religious men I have met are politicians in disguise; I, however, who wear the guise of a politician, am at heart a religious man." The spiritual authority which he wields today will doubtless reduce to dust and ashes the false values of the western world. Call him a philosophic anarchist or a mystical revolutionary or a herbalist with a nuisance value, still he is that rare bird whose winged flights point our minds to purer heights of spiritual radiance.

4. OFFICIAL SCHEMES FOR POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

THE FIRST world war "to end all wars," to make the world safe for democracy," "to make a land fit for heroes to live in" ushered in a period of disillusionment, cynicism and gross betrayal of the dead. The nations ran their bells on the Armistice Day but soon began wringing their hands. The complex of idealism and selfishness, of good intentions and bad judgment, of illusion and inertia accounts for the present catastrophe. The one lesson that does not need teaching twice is that it is not enough to win this war but the fruits of victory must be secured.

In 1850 it was believed that democracy and nationality, the twin forces born out of the American and French Revolutions, would build up a system of peace and liberty in Europe. The Prussian spirit was personified in Bismarck. By fostering quarrels between her rivals, he kept Germany safely at peace. The Prussian masters of the Reich resolved that the twentieth century must belong to Germany. *Weltreich oder Niedergang* (World Empire or Downfall), became the battle-cry of new Germany. It is true that this challenge to the British Empire was openly made. But it is express propaganda to say that the conflict is between two systems of ordering human affairs, between the pursuit of freedom and the pursuit of power. As Jawaharlal Nehru rightly points out, one cannot distinguish between the two conceptions of fascism and empire, and that fascism is indeed an intensified form of the same system which is imperialism.¹

The World War I came out and engulfed the world against the will of the people. It was the outcome of an imperialist organisation of an international society. The familiar argument that the positive cause for war was the subjection of the German people to the Prussian creed of power has now lost its glamour.

¹ Jawaharlal Nehru, *The Unity of India*, p. 268, 1941.

At one time it seemed not impossible for the Weimar Republic to develop into a great liberal state. The Allies did not support the proposal to form a republican army composed of people whose deepest interests would have led them to maintain the Republic against the threats of Tyranny. Democracy which had a chance in Germany was torpedoed and so Hitler came to power. Professor McGovern observes that Hitler's rise to power was accelerated by the monstrous Poincare and the savage Clemenseau. In Clemenseau the great Stalin was re-born; in the attorney Poincare, a mean Beelzebub. Through the joint efforts of this precious pair, the Treaty of Versailles was converted into a Pandora's box from which a host of evils has issued to plague mankind.¹

Hitler created a greater Reich than Bismark had achieved by three acts of force. In England people praised the Nazi system, its sense of public duty, its energy and its drive. When Hitler proceeded to nullify some of the fundamental clauses of the Treaty of Versailles, when he re-occupied and fortified Rhineland, when he enforced the Austrian Anschluss, when he finally tore away Sudetenland from Czechoslovakia, the appeasers let him have his way. They thought that Hitler would become content with the inclusion in *Gross-Deutschland* of all the contiguous territories inhabited by a majority of Germans. Those hopes were shattered by the seizure of Czechoslovakia. "The rare moment has come" said Dr. Goebbels "for the world to be apportioned anew." The German youths' war-song proclaimed "Today Germany belongs to us, tomorrow the whole world."²

The caricatures of the German press repeatedly showed the picture of John Bull, the man of great possessions, clutching his money-bags, while the poor and hungry German enviously looked on. This war is the second German with Britain, and the third with France. There should not be another war. Prussianism must be rooted out of the German mind and it must be brought in harmony with the western world. There is a liberal tradition in Germany, weaker than its foe. The young Germans must be taught to conceive their destiny in terms of international co-operation. It must not be caricatured, a second Versailles. A great majority of the neutral people must approve it.

The cause of war is the absence of the basis of the reign of law. Supreme power is essential to the reign of order through

¹ W.M. McGovern, *From Luther to Hitler; The History of Fascist Nazi Political Philosophy, 1941.*
² Quoted in *The Round Table*, December, 1939.

war. Originally man was the master of the Leviathan (the state) because Leviathan meant the reign of law; today he is becoming the servant of Leviathan. The reign of law must be based on power. We should envisage an order of human society whereunder man may pursue his spiritual destiny.¹

Any world union must be based on a sound tradition of human values. They include the profound respect for personality, liberty, experimentalism, tolerance, accommodation in social method, federalism, democracy and certain qualities of moralism and public spirit. With a mechanism resting on such secure pillars of high principle it would be easy to foresee eventual outlawry of war throughout the world.²

The history of the last two decades is essentially the history of the breakdown of the "Peace" initiated in 1919. Self-determination as between states and political liberty within the states was the American pattern of the European peace settlement of 1919. But the principle of self-determination was discarded in favour of strategic considerations and economic motives summed up in the synthetic formula *Lebenstraum*. The Covenant³ no doubt explicitly laid down the precept that only nations which were governing freely could become members of the League of Nations. This was interpreted as state sovereignty, not as a stipulation that there is freedom inside the state. Democracy and political freedom accepted by these post-war converts later on paved the way for dictatorship and totalitarianism. There was the complete subordination of the human person to the national group.

The good intentions of President Wilson were thwarted by the wiles of the European diplomats. He believed that if people were free to choose their masters then they would translate their pacific instincts into pacific politics. Therefore, political liberty was to supplant military autocracy. Secondly, an international stability could be secured only on the basis of international justice. International justice was conditioned by universal government by consent. This meant the application of the principle of self-determination. This new order had to be defended against any counter-offensive by mutual guarantee of

1 See Edward Mousley, *Man or Leviathan*, 1940.

2 See George Catlin, *Anglo-Saxony and Its Traditions*, 1939.

3 See Appendix A.

territorial integrity and political independence. This was the Wilsonian ideal.

In the Autumn of 1919, an Armistice contractually based on these principles was signed. Historic thrones were over-thrown and on their ruins rose liberal and democratic institutions. The peace settlement implemented the Fourteen Points of Wilson.¹ The reparations and other economic clauses of the Treaty were inspired by war psychosis. The crippled champion of internationalism addressing the Quadrennial Jackson Day Dinner on January 9, 1920, said "The United States is the only nation which has sufficient moral force with the rest of the world to guarantee the substitution of discussion for war. If we keep out of this agreement, if we do not give it our guarantees, then, another attempt will be made to crush the new nations of Europe."

The setting up of weak states without international protection only helped the dictators to hamstring them. The permanent interests of the whole were subordinated to the fluctuating interests of the parts, when the member states refused to part with their national sovereignty. Therefore, the League signally failed to bring about either lasting peace, or real justice or true freedom.

On January 2, 1941, twenty-six nations prefaced their signatures to a Grand Alliance, the Atlantic Charter,² by swearing their allegiance to the "common programme of purpose and principles." The Allies mean to take their way to this "simple rough and ready, war-time statement of the goal."

Point I of the Charter says "Their countries seek no aggrandisement, territorial or otherwise." To renounce the right of conquest or to frustrate any attempt to change the *status quo* by force is not enough. After the last war, the British assumed responsibilities for another million square miles of territory on the grounds of their philanthropic zeal and their strategic value. The appetite of the Tories for empire-building has shown no signs of abatement and they want to broaden the frontiers "wider yet and wider." Mr. Arnold Foster points out that during the negotiations leading upto the Anglo-Ethiopian Treaty of January 1942, certain British authorities were for months pressing the Emperor Haile Selasse to agree to important cession of the territory to the British Empire.³ Though the treaty contains no

¹ See Appendix B.

² See Appendix C.

³ Arnold Foster, "The Atlantic Charter". *The Political Quarterly*, June, 1942.

such provision, the danger of imperialist designs upon the territorial integrity of this state has probably not yet been wholly removed. The framers of the Charter have made no attempt to draw a just line between arrondissement and restitution.

Point 2 of the Charter lays down "They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned. The "new birth of freedom" in the countries now subjugated by Germany and Japan will undoubtedly enrich the world. The whole world will be splintered into unmanageable fragments if racial groups are allowed to determine their national allegiance regardless of the interests of neighbours. An authority even greater than Mr. Churchill will be needed to organise fair plebiscites in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Austria and other regions. On a long view, it would be sound policy if the Allies do not attempt from outside to parcel out the Reich, after the "final destruction of Nazi tyranny." A cautious timing of the definite recognition of the liberated body with the greatest moral and intellectual authority should undertake the re-drawing of frontiers.

Point 3 emphasizes "They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them." The grant of "sovereign rights" will stultify any "system of general security" or any "freedom from fear and want." To check militarist hysteria, to secure observance of international standards of liberty and justice and to sterilize anti-social behaviour, the new collective security must include a certain right of "intervention" in the fields of internal affairs. Mr. Churchill hastened to explain that Point 3 did not in any way qualify British policy as regards India or Burma. Mr. Arnold-Forster says "there is nothing in the Charter to justify this sweeping reservation, nor is it likely that the group of men, including Mr. Churchill and Mr. Amery, who have so dangerously mishandled the problem of Indian unity and emancipation, will be able much longer to withstand the forces which are now making for a quick and radical transformation of India's status as a nation." Again, only an international authority can formulate and enforce a charter of elementary human rights and protect it against the abuses of self-government.

Point 4 declares "They will endeavour, with due respect to their existing obligations, to further enjoyment by all states,

great or small, victor or vanquished, of access on equal terms to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity." This point will plunge into a bitter controversy the planners and the free traders. Unless some international authority acquires some rights and powers of supervision, review and ultimate control in fields of economic policy the economic bases of peace cannot be securely laid. Mr. Sumner Wells, referring to Point 4 at the I.L.O. Conference 1941, frankly admitted that America's high tariff policy after the last war had "brought poverty and despair to innumerable countries." "The United States Government," he said, "is determined to move towards the creation of conditions under which restrictive and unconscientious tariff preferentials and discriminations are things of the past." An international authority must be empowered to recognise as matters of international concern, policies which have the effect of restricting or diverting world trade. When Mr. Churchill reported on the Charter to the Parliament, he declared that the framers of the Charter have definitely adopted the view that it was not in the interest of the world "that any large nation should be unprosperous or shut out from the means of making a decent living for itself and its people by its industry and enterprise." Recently Mr. Churchill adroitly squeezed Sir Stafford Cripps out of his War Cabinet to appease the big business. In the light of this episode the promise of equality of trading opportunity to Germany proves to be sentimental stuff. Trade wars will begin after this war unless a peace system, economic and political, admitting Germans in all good faith as equal partners is evolved.

Point 5 says "They desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field, with the object of securing for all improved labour standards, economic advancement, and social security." Mere "collaboration" between states will not guarantee "social security." The nations must mount the next steps towards a Co-operative Commonwealth. Such a Commonwealth cannot possibly be developed without the formal abrogation of sovereignty. The control of the money-power exercised by the United States and Great Britain in economically backward areas has prevented or distorted the industrial development of those countries. The international organisation must acquire the powers, necessary for directing the flow of landing, on equitable terms, to the economically backward regions of the earth.

Point 6 provides "After the final destruction of Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want." The framers of the Charter have not misread the lesson of Versailles. The statesmen of 1919 ignored the fact that peace-making in the political field cannot achieve its end unless peace-making in the economic field is its complement.

Point 7 says "Such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance." This is only a concession to American sentiment, about the misty phrase "Freedom of the Seas."¹ It is a pious fraud to say that this Point would make the nations abandon the use of blockade and commerce prevention as instruments of national policy. It does not include freedom from blockade from air-craft and freedom from the arbitrary use of the deadly weapon of boycott.

Point 8 lays down "They believe all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as for spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea or air armaments continued to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security that the disarmament of such nations is inevitable. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for the peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments."

This point implies two stages in the process of peace-making; first, a transitional stage during which the unilateral disarmament of the defeated powers will have to be maintained and secondly, the stage in which the system of security is general. But the peace will blow up if within a measurable period equality of rights and status is denied to the vanquished powers. The real power exercised during the world's convalescence by the principal powers might become in their hands a permanent instrument of domination.

¹ Arnold Forster, *The New Freedom of the Seas*, 1942.

He says "The crucial question, by whom, at whose discretion, in whose interest may the high-seas be closed—cannot receive a durable answer from one nation." He concludes that the "Freedom of the Seas" should be built round a "New Commonwealth of Nations."



Photo : V. N. Kak

TWO WISE MEN OF INDIA

The Charter is vague and some of its points are inconsistent with others. And some of its out-worn phrases are taken from the nineteenth century political lexicon.¹

The first official pronouncement was made by the Japanese government setting forth its claim for a New Order in East Asia in November, 1938. A week after the fall of Hankow, the Japanese government came out with a statement to the effect that the ultimate purpose of the "Chinese Incident" was the establishment of a New Order based on a tripartite alliance of mutual aid and co-operation between Japan, Manchuria and China. The other powers were exhorted to formulate policies suited to the new conditions. The New Order was declared to be in complete conformity with the spirit in which the Japanese Empire had been founded. Its immediate establishment was the immutable policy and purpose of Japan.

In the middle of the nineteenth century Japan emerged out of its seclusion and ever since, it has nursed the illusion that the position of leadership in the Far East belonged by right to her. It was the historic mission of Japan to rescue the East from the clutches of the West and to establish over the emancipated Eastern Asia a Japanese controlled system where peace and political stability would prevail and all enjoy the benefits of *Kodo*. The Japanese have a fondness to clothe ideas peculiar to their own tribalism in phrases borrowed from Confucian conceptions. This has made them to suffer from split mind.

They solemnly declare that they propose to co-operate with China in spreading the benefits of paternal rule, and at the same time their legions are making a supreme effort to destroy the Chinese way of life. It is of the essence of tribalism to believe that whatever is for the good of the tribe is not morally wrong.

According to a Japanese spokesman, Admiral Sokichi Takahashi, Japan's going forward means the construction of the economic bloc with the linking of Japan, Manchukuo and China

¹ *The Berlin Radio* : " Old long discarded stock from the moth"chest of the varnished Versailles dialectic, bearing the Geneva hall-mark, which has been baled out and freshened up."

The Rome Radio : " It will be received with legitimate mistrust by nations of the whole world, which know what to think of the real intentions of the City and Wall Street bankers."

Cordell Hull : " Statement of basic principles and fundamental ideas of policies that are universal in their practical application."

Major Atlee : " It is applicable as much to the peoples of India and Africa as to those of Europe. The Labour Party will not deny to others the freedom that they fight for and that they want " to lift from all peoples those two great evils of fear of war and fear of want."

Sir T. B. Sapru : " It is stated that the August Declaration anticipated the wisdom of the Atlantic Charter. When we ask if the Charter applied to India, the reply is ' no.' Surely the English people ought to be able to say a simple thing in plain English language."

as independent countries in name and fact, rather than as semi-colonies. These should become junior partners with Japan under the paternal rule of the Japanese Emperor. In this bloc all the southern Pacific region, Netherlands, India, French Indo-China, Philippines, etc., should be included. The interest of the southern and northern peoples should become identical. Asia for the Asiatics means the ending of the colonial exploitation of Europe and America. The objective of the New Order in Asia is the well-being of all the races.¹

Hikomatsu Kamikawa defines as basic principles thus (i) the construction of blocs or the regional empires by the powerful states, (ii) the granting of mutual autonomous independence to the weak and smaller races and (iii) a world peace based on inter-bloc balance of power, which will supersede the old racial or continental peace. He asserts that the international organisation of peace can only be based on the concept of bloc-empires. International representation will be through bloc-membership and there will be no membership of individual countries.

The Japanese war-lords are intelligent opportunists who are cold-bloodedly devoted to their military time-table. Major K. Akiyama said "Japan has the heart of a dove of peace, but a snake—the United States and Great Britain, has placed its egg in the dove's nest." Words cannot be more cold and hypocritical. For more than forty years Japan has by successive acts of aggression demonstrated that she has no regard for the welfare of the Chinese people. She magnified the "China Incident" into the "East Asia Mutual Prosperity Bloc" to compensate for the lack of success in China, where the dead mounts to fully a million and still the daily drain on life goes on.²

The Munich surrender convinced all sections in Japan of the decadence of both England and France. It is estimated that the freezing of the Japanese assets in the United States of America, Great Britain and the Netherlands East Indies has cut off 60 per cent. of Japan's trade with countries outside of Yen bloc.

It is futile and foolish to say that Japan moves on strings moved from Berlin. No doubt her strategy is built on the assumption that the war will see Herr Hitler enthroned on the continent

¹ William Magistretti, "Japan's New Order in the Pacific", *Pacific Affairs*, Vol. XIV June, 1942.

Japan's New Order, *The Round Table*, December, 1941.

² W. W. Willoughby, *Japan's Case Examined*, 1940.

of Europe. The twenty-six sovereign states, broken and bleeding will fall prostrate at his feet. Already the beating wings of the Japanese planes have darkened half the skies of East Asia. With little fighting she has established a semi-circle of bases from Burma, Thailand to Saigon, to Hainan. Now she is in a position to cut the American lines of communication. In the words of Captain Otaku "Our Japanese race reared in the temperate zone, is capable of expanding either to the north or south. It might be said that we are all like a mobile fleet which can be active in all quarters when necessity dictates."

Japan has been a feudal state for over 2000 years and she remains a feudalism now. Additional rigidity has been imparted to her feudal characteristics by the domination of half a dozen huge syndicates and by the unique privileges of the army and the navy. The creed of the Emperor's Divinity has been a potent instrument for strengthening the military grip on political affairs. Even the members of the Diet are not safe from the tyranny of the police. War and not peace has become the chief aim of society, and every human and social activity is moral if it prepares for war.

The European counterpart of Japanese militarism is Nazism. It is said that the Nazi movement is the revolt of the German 'romantic' soul against the nobler part of the German cultural heritage. The bad element in the German culture is for Mr. Peter Niereck "romanticism."¹ It insists that the organic and indivisible nature of human life, provides an ineffable source of light and truth beyond the meddling of reason, beyond the standards of law and custom, beyond anything set and established. Politically their romanticism has resulted in the cult of the master race, the Fuehrer, the unending discontent and striving which is a perpetual political psychosis. A good element in German culture is the discipline and sense of measure, the civilization which Romans brought to Germany and which the Germans have wholly rejected or wholly accepted. The mind of the German is torn by two conflicting forces: romanticism and classicism, "two souls in one breast."

Dr. Karl Haushofer has influenced Nazi policy and German thinking decisively. Haushofer believed that a Russian-German-

¹ Peter Niereck, *Metapolitics: From the Romantics to Hitler*, 1941.

"The ideology of Fascism was largely created by such romanticist aesthetes and intellectuals as D'Annunzio in Italy and Nietzsche and Stefan George in Germany. Viewed in terms of intellectual history, Fascism marks the final stage in the romantic degeneration."

Japanese alliance was in the destined order of things.¹ His influence failed to avert the memorable attack in June 1941, when Hitler hurled the biggest armed assault in history against the Soviet Union. The original basis of the Nazi policy was the *Blut und Boden* doctrine—the gathering of all Germans within the Reich. That phase was succeeded by the doctrine of *Lebensraum* and that in turn by the doctrine *Grossraum*. Haushofer has worked to fearsome purpose and he has done it without making the original Nazis too conscious of the radical departure from their old doctrine. The implications are immense. The earth is to be regarded as a fascinating playground for the working of power aims. It takes no account of human values or the dignity of human life. In short, German Geopolitics has become nothing but the ground-work for a military *Weltanschauung*.

It is suggested that fascism is the final form of capitalism, and is, therefore, even less stable than capitalism in its earlier stages. Such a conception leads to dangerously false practical deductions. Mr. G. D. H. Cole is of opinion that under the Hitler system the German economic structure is more stable than the system of the non-totalitarian capitalist countries.² In Germany "Trade Cycle" is non-existent. Production is maintained at the highest level consistent with the available supply of national resources. The gain from continuous full use of available productive resources is very great. It serves to offset the losses resulting from the autarkic policy of producing at home inferior substitutes for goods which previously imported.

The element of insecurity prevailing in the capitalistic production is removed. Though the standard of living is very low yet it is very sure. Some margin of profit is assured as there is a certain market at a price fixed under state control for almost every type of output that German industry or agriculture is allowed to produce. The level of profit is determined by the state. The state is the biggest employer of labour and the largest consumer of the total output. It rigidly controls the means of payment abroad and all forms of foreign exchange. It controls imports by direct rationing and the export trade is

1 H. W. Weigert, *German Geopolitics*, 1942.

"It is of vital necessity" says Haushofer, "that Russia and Germany unite their powers." He adds, "Germans and Russians finally recognised that both of them had been the victims, and, by fighting each other to the death, had only pulled the chestnuts out of the fire for the sake of the imperialist aims of the western neighbouring powers, whereby they had burned their flesh and crippled their souls." (p. 19).

2 G. D. H. Cole, "Nazi Economics: How Do They Manage It?"

The Political Quarterly, January-March, 1939.

dependent on subsidies. Huge blocks of Jewish owned capital are transferred to state ownership. The German speculator is confined to the home capital market as foreign investments are banned. The control of imports is an effective instrument in the hands of the state to regulate the consumption of the German people.

Wage-rates and costs of production are determined by the state. The control over the selling prices has given to the state the power of controlling the level of business profits. The companies are not free to distribute the dividends of their shareholders. The state organs of economic planning will direct the companies in their investment of their surplus profit in new capital goods. The only channel for the investment of private savings is state loans. Surplus profit is not allowed to be left idle. New capital issues and bank advances are controlled by the state. Only goods which the Germans could spare constitute the bulk of the export trade. The shifts of foreign trade from country to country illustrate German skill in the art of tricking creditors. Sometimes payment is not made or delayed deliberately for imports. Sometimes it is made in various kinds of blocked marks or in heavily over-priced German goods which the creditors are compelled to accept.

The working classes are kept in a condition of assured subjection, Nazism is rightly stigmatized as the servile state—the universal destroyer of political as well as economic liberty. It binds the agricultural labourers to the soil and harnesses the industrial worker to the wheels of machine production. It swindles its creditors and confiscates the property of the Jews and the foreign emigrés. The pursuit of war as an end is part of its nature. Force is its instrument of exploitation.

It is indeed the real tragedy of the Nazi occupied Europe that its millions are being absorbed into the unitary economic dispensation of the Reich. There the Nazis have turned back the wheel of economic development and thus narrowed the basis of their economic system. The German conquerers have not conquered by steel alone and Dr. Shascht's economic strategy has left nothing of world history to chance.

The ingenious Nazi propaganda in the occupied countries has played with signal success upon the varied hates and discontents, upon the aspirations of Europe.¹ The blinkered business com-

¹ Thomas Reville, *The Spoil of Europe: The Nazi Technique in Political and Economic Conquest*, 1942.

munity yielded to the blandishments of the Nazi New Order. Militant Catholics, conservative interests and unfulfilled communists proved easy prey to Dr. Goebbels. The occupation of Europe assumed diverse legal attributes for an identical predatory end. The process of Nazification is proceeding at vigorous tempo in the various conquered or annexed territories. The younger generation of the French, the Czechs, the Poles, the Serbs, the Norwegians, the Belgians, the Danes, the Dutch and the Greeks is being prepared for its destiny by the complete overhauling of the educational system.

The first stages of occupation are marked by the seizure of stocks of raw materials, finished products, industrial machinery and railway rolling stock which are promptly removed to Germany. The second stage will be the adoption of measures for integrating the industry of the occupied territory into the expanding German war economy. Certain areas are maintained as purely agricultural or raw material domains of the Reich or to insure that there shall be no competition with German concerns or to make it impossible for subjugated country to manufacture instruments of war. The introduction of the device of "cost of occupation" is bare-faced plunder with an air of legality. Its avowed object is to complement German production and to acquire control in every strategically important enterprises. Such costs have little or no relation to the actual expenditure incurred in maintaining the German forces in occupation but are based on the maximum war budget of the country in question before the Nazi conquest. In 1941 an article in *The Times* said "Hitler is already trying to change Europe so radically in favour of the 'master people' that nothing will ever be done to change it back." The Nazi technique of economic and political spoliation of Europe is put into force by the economic mobile units. A people turned sour by defeat and despair are now hating the Nazis with neurotic vehemence.

The communist conception of a New Order has passed through several stages. The world is not exclusively communist. It is very doubtful whether it would ever become so without a series of violent civil wars. Even then it will certainly not provide a sound economic foundation for durable peace.

Three major periods are seen in the development of the Comintern. During the first period it was mainly an instrument to bring about revolution. The Russian factional struggles

dominated the second period. In the third period it became mainly an instrument of Russian foreign policy. For the true Communist this whole evolution can only be the result of an immense betrayal.

The First International which was founded by Marx in 1864 was not a revolutionary party in the Marxian sense. It lacked cohesive force and was a loose international union of working men's organisation of all kinds. The First International broke up in seventies in consequence of internal feuds, and Marx's autocratic methods. The Second International adopted Marx's theories. But they were radically modified to suit the needs of a non-revolutionary age. By pursuing the policy of socialism in a single land alone, Stalin proclaimed the dissolution of the Third International as an independent and active Labour movement.

Trotsky urged war to the death on the theory of socialism in a single country. He vehemently criticised the mistakes of the ruling bureaucracy in Russia and demanded the pursuit of a resolute international proletarian policy. Russia judged conditions in a foreign country from the stand-point of her own state interests. In Germany her policy was based on the Treaty of Rapallo and friendship with a middle-class republican government. Her policy in China was founded on the agreement with the Kuomintang government, and in both cases discounted the possibility of an independent proletarian revolution. When it was too late Russia discovered that both these countries were in a revolutionary mood, and the chances of victory had been favourable.

The Communist International suffered the first defeat when Mussolini came to power in Italy. The collapse of the revolutionary movement in Germany was the second and decisive defeat sustained by it. The defeat of the Chinese revolution destroyed the last serious chance of the Comintern in the world drama. It has no longer any marked influence upon the course of the world proletarian movement. The Communists in countries other than Russia have sunk to the level of an ineffective and discredited minority.¹

In 1917 the problem of peace seemed abstract and unreal. Today technical experts and scholars with academic backgrounds

¹ See Borkenau, *World Communism*, 1939; Robert Hunter, *Revolution? Why, How, When?* 1940. Arthur Rosenberg, *A History of Bolshevism*.

The Communist Party of the United States now declares not only that it does not now advocate revolution, but also it never did advocate revolution.

are planning for a decent organisation for political stability and lasting peace. Their designs for world order fall into two categories (1) the policies of nations and (2) the organisation and constitution of bodies which should carry out these policies. All the planners agree that the world has become an interconnected economic unit managed by a group of unconnected powers. The nationalist system of independent and fully sovereign states is completing its cycle of usefulness. It is imperative that there should be a transition to a New Order, which will rid the world of economic wrangles between groups, eliminate force and war and guarantee the personal liberties and opportunities of every individual.

The problem of organising peace, according to these planning "experts" is the problem of replacing the dispersion of the tools of violence among a number of approximately equal competitors for power by a centralisation and integration of one or a few or of central organs of the whole community.¹ The essence of order is a monopoly of violence in the hands of the guardians of order. Modern total wars are a product of the assumption of violence. Rulers believe that it is more advantageous than dangerous to play the power game and by force or fraud to secure control of things that measure capacity to fight. These advantages are possible because of rough equilibrium of potential fighting strength between rival states or rival coalitions of states. In an unstable balance opportunities are ever present for unilateral action, with Allies or Partners or Quislings to shift the balance in one's favour. Such action involves war when supported by arms and encounters armed resistance.

Outlawry of war requires the destruction of the theory of balance of power, and the prevention of its re-establishment. The goal in theory is obtainable through (i) a permanent coalition of powerful states (ii) a regional or universal confederation (iii) a federal central government (iv) Universal Empire after the model of Rome and through (v) a military world state. All these schemes necessarily presuppose the creation and perpetuation of international coercive authority sufficient to abolish rivalry for power and impose its will on the members of the community of nations. The father of the modern world planning J. G. Fische attributed the wars of his time to commercial rivalries and to the struggle for colonies. Permanent peace could be secured only

¹ Professor Fredrick L. Schuman, "War, Peace and the Balance of Power", *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 1940.

by the abolition of international trade, the democratization of the colonies, and some peaceful exchanges of territories which would make all nations self-sufficient. In order to achieve this, a planned society will have to be established in which governments would regulate production, distribution and consumption.¹

But the powerful movements towards autarchy in Europe did not envisage pacifist purposes. The object of the European governments was to destroy the pressure blockade and economic sanctions. Therefore, a world society of self-sufficient nations which will guarantee political stability and equality is unrealisable. A collective organisation of economics is inevitable in a closed commercial state. It may lead to the triumph of exclusive nationalism. The collective trend in Italy, Germany and Japan has resulted in inflamed nationalisms. They demand not equality but superiority.

Capitalism became monopolistic in its old age and had to annex new territories for monopolistic exploitation in order not to wither. Britain, its pre-eminent champion, has transformed her open empire into a closed empire. We can scarcely expect a return to Cobdenite ideas and universal sterilization of economic frontiers. In an atomized liberal state, frontiers show where distinct political units merge; under a regimented system, they mark the points separation. Therefore, there is no guarantee that groups and individuals controlling a collectivist society will be free from war-mongering instincts. Modern collectivist societies are either egalitarian as Russia or hierachical as Germany.² The former is territorially satiated, the latter is not. Its stratified military collectivism, has made Germany acquisitive and bellicose. Stalin's Russia is not aggressive and it has envisaged national welfare in terms of external peace. But this should not lead us to the belief that Russia's pacifism is due to its collectivism.

The six official schemes for political stability and permanent peace examined in this chapter have inherent defects. We want a

1 Engels said in *Anti-Duhring*: "The ultimate causes of all social changes and political revolutions are to be sought not in the minds of men..... but in changes in the mode of production and exchange. The growing realization that existing changes have been taking place quietly in the methods of production and forms of exchange, with which the social order, adapted to previous economic conditions is no longer in accord". (*A Handbook of Marxism*, p. 279).

2 In April, 1934, Earl Browder was declaring that "Roosevelt's programme, is a programme of hunger, fascization, and imperialist war..... The New Deal is not developed Fascism. But in political essence and direction it is the same as Hitler's programme. Roosevelt leading the present ruling class and finance capital stands for degradation, hunger, misery, oppression, Fascism, war." (See Browder's Report to the 8th Convention of the Communist Party, pp. 20, 32).

peace which will recognise the fact that the gospel of force is the gospel of anarchy ; a peace which will deliberately take into account the rights of colonial peoples now exploited by " good " English and French imperialists ; and a peace which will give meaning to the idea of co-operation.

5. PROBLEMS OF IMMEDIATE RECONSTRUCTION

AT THE END of the present hostilities a revolutionary frame of mind should confront an attitude of political complacency towards the problems of immediate reconstruction. The attraction of the totalitarian ideologies lay not in their obscure and incoherent doctrines but in the fact that they do not invite their followers to worship an out-moded political ideal enshrined in the dim past. Therefore, the problems of the post-war world must be approached with the conviction not to stabilise, but to revolutionise.

Professor Whitehead says that the middle-class pessimism over the future of the world comes from a confusion between civilization and security. In the immediate future there will be less security than in the immediate past, less stability. According to him, the great ages have been unstable ages. It follows that a generation which makes peace and security its principal aim is doomed to frustration. The only stability attainable in human affairs is the stability of the spinning top. If the condition of stability is continuous advance then a society can retain a stable equilibrium so long as it refuses to become static.

The idealistic urges created in the last war faded away into indolence. War-weariness and the desire to return to normal life eclipsed the vague yearnings to play an effective role in the building of a new world.¹ Surely, the negative war aim of the destruction, in the words of Mr. Churchill of "seventy million malignant Huns" is futile and deceptive. To prevent cynicism descending like an extinguisher on the newly born hopes of mankind some positive and constructive ideals must be envisaged. Penalisation, dismemberment and permanent

¹ "When in the last days of the war the British government, supported by various American officials in Europe, put forward tentative proposals to the American government at Washington for the maintenance of economic co-operation during the reconstruction period, the reply of Dr. Hoover then Secretary of Commerce, was "emphatically and indeed brutally negative, or perhaps it would be more correct to say, self-regarding".

(A. Zimmermann, *The League of Nations and the Rule of Law*, p. 157).

coercion of the vanquished are morally repugnant, physically impossible and economically disastrous. Even if the United Nations win this war, the adoption of vindictive measures will make them lose the peace.

The extensive military occupation will follow the defeat of the Axis powers. At the end of this war chaos will be graver and more widespread than in 1918. The Nazi regime has stamped out the leaders of an opposition. It will be political unwisdom to construct an alternative government round the nucleus of refugees. The New Order must bring the Germans not new privations but a higher measure of spiritual and economic well-being. Then disarmament should not be punitive and the people must be invited to share the task of maintaining order. Instead of fixing "war guilt" and imposing reparations, it would be reasonable to demand German participation in the reconstruction of ravaged countries.

In considering the economic aspects of a durable peace, we have to consider also the economic condition of the belligerents and the neutrals at the date of the peace. In England, current expenditures are running at an annual rate of \$9,600,000,000 or at about 40% of the estimated national income for 1939, of \$24,900,000,000. To meet this expenditure the individual income-tax has been raised to 37% and corporation excess tax to 60%. In France the estimate for expenditure in 1940 was \$7,400,000,000 or 40% of the national income. Australia's budget for 1939-40 calls for the expenditure of \$200,000,000 or six times that of the previous year. Canada's cost up to the end of March 1941 was estimated at \$500,000,000. Japan's budget for 1941 was \$2,415,000,000, five times more than that before the outbreak of hostilities. The government expenditure of Germany accounts to 60% of its national income. The estimated income of Great Britain from her overseas investment in 1938 was £200,000,000. She will end the war on balance as a debtor.

It is problematical whether any government in Europe will be solvent a year from now if the war should prolong. These expenditures by belligerents, both capital for armaments and for feeding and paying men under arms, are non-productive. The daily shipping losses are in itself an elimination of wealth and of the savings of the world.

It has been estimated that the present time Europe has 25 million men under arms and 75 million more employed in war

industries. The re-absorption into the normal productive process of this man-power drawn by the war into the armed forces and into munition-making and the diversion of material and plant from war-time to peace-time production present insuperable difficulties. The transition from war to peace will consist of three phases; the phase of relief, the phase of rebuilding and the phase of economic planning. The form of control and co-operation already created by Hitler's New Order and by the United Nations' war-time machinery should be carried forward into the period of peace. The economic machinery will include pooling of raw materials, joint-purchasing arrangements, standardization of certain essential forms of production, joint control of shipping, financing of common needs and correlation of currencies. Supra-national Relief Corporation and Economic Planning Commission must be created. These institutions must enshrine the principle of equal co-operation between peoples. The principle powers of the world must provide leadership in construction.

The war will leave an abnormal frame of mind in the people. The war-time blend of stupidity and vindictiveness with idealism and faith will react on the peace settlement. War-time psychosis cannot make an enduring peace. Therefore, it is suggested that a considerable interval should be allowed to lapse between Armistice and Peace Conference. In 1919 Peace-making was considered a single historical event limited in time and space. The after results of the last war in hunger and misery, disorder and decay throughout Eastern and Central Europe were terrible.¹ The after consequences of a total war in air-attacks reducing great and populous areas into a waste land in which terror rules and pestilence stalks will be more tragic. Can an appeal for peaceful living have effect on persons in whose hearts treachery has plunged the dagger of hatred and mistrust?² Will the unemployed soldiers and workers set the forces of violent revolution alight everywhere?

1 Mr. Churchill narrates the circumstances which finally compelled the Allied Governments to remove the blockade from Germany in March, 1919: "Lord Plumer, who commanded the British Army of Occupation in Germany, sent a telegram to the War Office, forwarded to the Supreme Council urging that food should be supplied to the suffering population in order to prevent the spread of disorder on humanitarian grounds. He emphasised the bad effect produced upon the British army by the spectacle of suffering which surrounded them. From him and through other channels we learned that the British soldiers would certainly share their rations with the women and children among whom they were living, and that the physical efficiency of the troops was already being affected." (*The World Crisis*, p. 87).

2 "Even were the French people to rally to the standard of Free France and to play their part in ridding their own country and Europe of the Nazi and Fascist curse, the memory of the men of Vichy, as voluptuaries of humiliation and devotees of dishonour, would prevent many minds from accepting French guidance in European reconstruction. France would still have to work out her own salvation, to save her own soul before it could again illumine Europe with the radiance of its light." (Wickham Steed in *Free Europe*, p. 11, November 15, 1940).

Can the sword be beaten into the ploughshare in an instant? It is against these dangers the future peace-makers must prepare. This demands a preparation in advance of a programme of world reconstruction.

The main task in the immediate post-war world will be to attack the famine problem through the transport. The breakdown of transport will hamper the regular and orderly distribution of supplies. The inclination of the local interests to exploit chaos for short-term advantages should be checked. It is foolish to expect that as the guns cease fire, food would be distributed among the starving millions all over the stricken countries. From now on all the nations must allocate manpower and manufacture agricultural tools to grow essential foodstuffs. They must produce and build huge stocks according to a plan.

A Supra-national Planning Commission should be the ultimate authority responsible for vital decisions on economic policies. The war has placed an enormous concentration of economic power in the hands of the belligerents. The Commission will be the heir of this going concern. Hitler's New Order offers at a price—order, security and unification. But his scheme is based on the hypothesis of German predominance. The Commission must reject the principle of differentiated standard of living. It must determine the relation between different branches of production by the order of priority of the consumers' needs. It must organise and plan the future expansion of consumption. It will aim at the increasing equalisation of the standards of living and a wider distribution of the processes of production. It must encourage regional industrial groupings cutting across national frontiers. To promote international exchange of goods will be one of the main instruments of its policy. All exchanges must ultimately be exchanges of goods and services, not of money. All trade whether bilateral or multi-lateral should partake the nature of barter. The class with financial claims should be promptly wiped off as mischievous.

A Supra-national Bank should control investment, financing of trade, liquidation of claims and the control of currency. International gold standard currency was a "managed currency." It was managed by the bankers and bill-brokers of London. The attempt to resuscitate it broke down in 1925 as

soon as the United States of America, the largest creditor country was unwilling to lend freely to Germany, the largest debtor country. The Tripartite Agreement of 1936 between Great Britain, the United States and France was regarded in some quarters as an initial step toward the revival of a single international standard. But neither London nor New York had the will or capacity to make extensive loans to foreign countries. An unrestricted flow of international trade is essential for the existence of such a standard. So long as the United States refuse to admit freely, goods and immigrants from countries with a lower standard of living, this will prove a sheer delusion. There is no practical draw-back in having separate currencies circulating in several supra-national areas so long as they can be exchanged at a fixed rate for sterling or for one another. This fixed relation should be maintained by a World Bank.¹

A Public Works Corporation must undertake an extensive building programme. Public funds might be used to build decent houses for the mass of population. The country should be replanned under the direction of the Planning Commission. The principal aim in view will be the better distribution of industry over the country, the wider dispersal of population and a reduction in the size of the great urban units. It is undesirable that a quarter of the population of Great Britain should live within a radius of some 20 miles from Charing Cross. The replanning of industry, a new public works and transport policy and a new housing programme are interconnected. The only limit of the reconstruction programme should be the extent of the resources in material and man-power. The Planning Commission must determine the priority of requirements and secure the allocation of materials and man-power to meet them. The purpose of the economic system should be to provide the thing wanted for consumption. The first call is for the basic necessities of life—food, housing, clothing and fuel. In this scheme may be included free electric cookers, subsidised radio-sets, national theatres or concerts and free holiday trips.

A successful organisation for peace involves a measure of permanent control over the whole of the national economic life.

¹ "It will be our wish" said Mr. Eden in his Mansion House speech on peace aims of May 29 1941, "to work with others to prevent.....the currency disorders throughout Europe and the wide fluctuations of employment, markets and prices which were the cause of so much misery in the twenty years between the two wars." The experience of that period shows that such an end cannot be achieved without the establishment of some effective international authority.

All branches of production have taken on monopolistic forms. Each branch of production should be organised as a Corporation.¹ The two social functions of production are producing goods to the consumer and providing jobs for the worker. State intervention must be directed for the protection of these essential interests. The State must exercise a control over prices, wages and return of capital. The establishment of a single, co-ordinated planned control over these factors is a paramount need of modern industrial civilization. Essential industries and essential services should be conducted in the form of autonomous units under Government control, paying interest rather than profits, on the capital invested in them. Luxury industries may be permitted to operate in the conditions of a free market.

The problem of nutrition calls for attention on a world-wide basis. The investigations of Seebhom Rowntree showed that in Britain there are millions of families which cannot afford the absolute minimum diet necessary to keep them from real starvation and enable them to work. To the poor, rationing is a joke in a bad taste. In Britain more than 15 million citizens receive coupons for butter and bacon, but they cannot buy the butter and bacon. In countries like China and India where low living standards prevail a definite and substantial effort should be made to remedy the condition of malnutrition too staggering for belief.

Above all, it is imperative that Rights and Duties should be clearly stated and safeguarded. In 1919 democracy received the highest lip-service than ever before. By 1935 it became a mockery than a dynamic force in world affairs. The supremacy of the party machine dominated by economic interest became a distinguishing mark of British democracy. Mere democratic form did not confer reality of power. Nineteenth century liberal democracy collapsed when organised economic power determined to influence issues of national economic life.

Since the days of the French Revolution western civilization grew up round the idea of political rights. The strangle-hold of Big Business and the emergence of bureaucracy spelled the decline of democratic rights. This "new bondage" reduced the democratic ideal to a hollow fiction.² The new democracy

1 "The choice is not between competition and monopoly, but between a monopoly which is responsible and private and a monopoly which is responsible and public." (R. H. Tawney, *The Acquisition Society*, p. 225).

2 "The principle of accumulation based on inequality was a vital part of the pre-war order of society." (J. M. Keynes, *The Economic Consequences of the Peace*, p. 19).

which tries to make the masses conscious of their rights is in the throes of rebirth.

The new democracy must reinterpret the democratic ideals in economic terms. It must make political rights safe from the inroads of economic power. A common obligation to make democratic institutions work is urgent. A sense of shared obligation will grow only when there is a sense of equitably shared benefit. This implies that economic equality should supplant political equality.

President Wilson thought that the principle of self-determination was the infallible short-cut to a political paradise. The result was a large number of small states which came into conflict with the reality of military and economic power were created. It required the experience of 1940 to demonstrate that the neutrality and independence of small states is a fantasy unless real power is present capable of sustaining them. Small states can no longer balance themselves on the tight rope of absolute neutrality.

The Rights of Man must include the right to work and the right not to starve. The perils of the future lie not so much in frontiers and sovereignties, but in food and shelter. The political right of national self-determination must be harmonised with the exigencies of economic interdependence. A new social conscience based on an inter-twined net-work of loyalties must be promoted. A system of divided but not incompatible loyalties is the most acceptable solution of the problem of self-determination. It must be a right exercised within the framework of obligation. The international relations of the future must recognise the need for a supra-national unit and within this unit for the largest measure of devolution for other purposes.

The peace of 1919 was a punitive peace. The acuteness of the political and economic disequilibrium of the past twenty years has been chiefly due to the failure of the peace-makers to solve the fundamental economic problem. The future treaty should make no provisions for indemnities or reparation.¹ The

¹ See *The Eighth Fortune Round Table*, "Peace Aims", p. 8, February, 1941; Lynn Thorndike, "peace Aims: A specific proposal", *Political Science Quarterly*, March, 1942.

In the autumn of 1919, Baron Keynes penned the unheeded warning: "If we aim deliberately at the impoverishment of Central Europe, vengeance, I dare predict, will not come limping.

"Nothing can then delay for very long that final civil war between the forms of reaction and the despairing convulsions of revolution, before which, the horrors of the late German war will fade into nothing, and which will destroy, whoever is victor, the civilisation and progress of our generation."

(*The Economic Consequences of the Peace*, p. 251).

Part of the problem of undoing an abnormal history is to restore the self-respect and inner integrity of the victim of that history," (J. W. Parkes, *The Jewish Question*, p. 81).

Allies should surrender all territories they may conquer or occupy during the war. Germany and Russia should surrender Finland and Poland, except Danzig and the Polish Corridor, all of Czechoslovakia except Sudetanland, and leave for a plebiscite the question as to whether the people in Austria, Danzig, the Polish Corridor, Memel and the Sudetan desire their former independence or wish to remain a part of the German Reich. Japan must be asked to return to the pre-war frontiers. The treaty should contain an express stipulation as to disarmament by the parties to the treaty. It should embody a clause that the contracting parties shall call a conference at which all nations shall be asked to form supra-national unions, will agree upon (i) disarmament, (ii) abolition of tariffs, quota and exchange restrictions, (iii) maintenance of Peace Brigades, ((iv) free access to raw materials to all nations, (v) regulation of labour, wages and living standards, (vi) planned consumption and (vii) a Bill of Rights.

The state exists for the purpose of serving the individual and it must be subordinated to that purpose. The essential condition is maintenance of cultural and material interchange. To serve this purpose there must be an organisation having power within agreed fields or limits, to make decisions and lay down rules binding all members. The rights of the member states in such a supra-national union must be guaranteed within a clear frame-work of their obligations. These regional divisions of the universal system will have a large degree of autonomy. Such a state mechanism will uphold law, administer justice and prevent violence.¹

¹ Those who can win a war well can rarely make a good peace, and those who could make a good peace would never have won the war." (Winston Churchill, *My Early Life*, p. 346).

6. PLANNING FOR LASTING PEACE

(1)

LIMITED UNIONS

A STABLE peace system must depend upon law and co-operation. There will be a transition period between the end of the war and the beginning of peace. The integration of the states in a new international order is possible if only the foundations for a return to economic prosperity and political stability are laid in that period.

The procedure of peace-making must consist of an Armistice, which will clearly lay down conditions for ending the hostilities. It should also make provision for a transition period from war to peace and the definitive peace settlement. The transition period in itself must be a conscious building of that system.

The best Armistice terms according to Leonard Woolf¹ are the unconditional surrender of the German Government, the occupation and complete disarmament of Germany, an inter-allied administration of the German territory, with no undertaking as to the period of occupation or date of evacuation. He also suggests that the Allies should declare their intention either at the time of Armistice or after the actual surrender of Germany that at some future time and before their evacuation of Germany, they would allow the Germans to elect a Constituent Assembly, which would determine the future form of government.

The transition period will be riddled with many difficulties. Europe will be in the grip of economic chaos. An international Economic Commission, with very extensive powers should be formed. An attempt should be made by the Three principal Powers, the United States, the British Empire and the U.S.S.R. to work out and agree upon the fundamental principles of

¹ Leonard Woolf, "How to Make The Peace", *The Political Quarterly*, October-December, Vol. XII, 1941.

economic reconstruction. There should also be unanimous agreement between them on the ultimate political settlement and structure.

The gravity of the threat of political chaos cannot be minimised. The entry of the U.S.S.R. as a belligerent will greatly contribute to the successful making of peace. But the ending of hostilities might witness a curious situation. Some of the European states may have two governments; a revolutionary government in the territory itself; and another government living in exile in London.

However, it should be emphasised that those who contemplate with equanimity a series of civil wars as a part of the process of European reconstruction betray their ignorance of history and of human nature.

We can guess beforehand some of the problems that the peace-makers will have to face. The extent and method of limiting sovereignty and independence of individual states to achieve economic and political integration should be carefully determined. To rigidly limit the economic and political sovereignty of states and at the same time to assure their freedom is a ticklish problem. They must also devise the means to construct "the wider and permanent system of general security." The problem of bringing the aggressor state into an international system cannot be cheaply minimised.

The relation of an Anglo-American bloc towards Europe on the one hand and towards Eastern Asia on the other will constitute the chief problem after the war. A united self-governing India may willingly join in free association with this bloc, to which in outlook she is already closely allied. The evolution of Russia's foreign policy during the present war will influence the relation of the bloc towards Russia.

It is necessary to separate cultural differences from the possession of political authority. This can only be realised if the Anglo-American bloc undertakes a bold experiment in European development. The Allied States too should be drawn within the sphere of the bloc's influence. The continental naval and air bases must be allowed to be used by Anglo-American naval and air forces in case of emergency in return for a common currency, common availability of raw materials, close economic collaboration possibly a common nationality.

Professor Keeton asserts that any attempt to keep Germany, either by military occupation or economic pressure would fail as soon as the mood of revenge has passed.¹

According to Miss Barbara Ward, the post-war reconstruction of Europe is essentially a political task. For, the centres of political power in our times are virtually co-extensive with the centres of industrial power. The advance in technology has resulted in centralisation, and the consequences of these changes expressed in total war are leading peoples to prefer stability at a low level to the chance of raising their standards at a risk.²

Therefore, the shape of the future peace is conditioned by the fusion between planning for economic security with the preservation of Europe's diverse political and social conditions. But it is to be remembered that so long as the conception of sovereignty is not effectively modified, economic policies and economic boundaries will inevitably follow national frontiers.

To fit a defeated Germany into an agreed frame-work is a difficult task. A European control of raw materials means control of the vital raw materials that lie within Germany. Further, the military and political rights of a nation-state eighty million strong, will have to be modified to the benefit of its smaller neighbours. The peace-maker will have to settle these outstanding problems.

As opposed to the view of Mr. Woolf, Miss Ward argues that there should be no spectacular marking of the transition from war to peace. It will be meaningless and pernicious. Peace conferences concluded in a set period belong to the days before total war. Peace is created by the gradual re-emergence of a community of men and of nations who will live and work together.

Miss Ward advocates the establishment of two key institutions; a Military Mission, to keep order and an Economic Mission, to feed and restock stricken Europe. These institutions should derive their powers from the political authority of the victors. She suggests that the Economic Mission might develop with widened representation into a European Planning Board, while subsidiary commissions control key industries and public

¹ G. W. Keeton, "Anglo-American Co-operation," *The Political Quarterly*, October-December, 1941.

² Barbara, Ward, "Prolegomena to Peace Aims," *The Political Quarterly*, July-September, 1941.

utilities. Similarly, the Military Commission could be transformed into the General Staff of a European Defence Force, policing key strategic points and composed of different national army corps. She admits that there are still possibilities and their securing will depend upon the initiative of Britain and the United States.

Miss Ward holds the view that it should be the aim of the Economic Mission to ensure that Germany's prosperity would return at the same pace as that of Europe. She pointedly asks "If Germany does not 'go straight,' what then?" She concludes that there will be no unity and order in Europe without an effective centre of power and that Centre can only be Britain and the United States.

The two fairly definite proposals for a federation of peoples, one by Sir John Fischer and the other by Sir William Beveridge¹ call for a written constitution on the American model. Membership would be open to those with a community of social and political outlook. A federation of central and western Europe and the British Commonwealth is advocated. There must be enough membership to guarantee security. The practical limit is to create machinery for action in foreign affairs. To include dominion over army, commerce and migration would be a great help. Sir John Fischer's plan provides for an assembly of delegates or a council to govern the federation. The delegates would represent the constituent states in some proportion to population. This concil would be presided over by an elected Chairman and would itself appoint three executive ministers to conduct the foreign affairs, the military affairs and the exchequer. The size and character of the armed forces would be incorporated in the original charter. A supreme Federal Court with authority to settle disputes between states or a state and the federation completes the picture.

Sir William Beveridge's scheme of delegated powers includes also equal access to all colonies or dependencies. He would incorporate an equivalent of the American Bill of Rights in the organic law. Beveridge despairs of including the United States but he considers it essential to include Germany.

Mr. Clarence Streit² urges an immediate union of the United States with Great Britain and the Dominions as the only means

¹ Sir William Beveridge, "*Peace by Federation?*" 1940.

² Clarence Streit, *Federal Union*, 1940; *Union Now With America*, 1941.

of ending this war quickly. He repeats the Churchillian offer to France of a common citizenship, which includes control of defence, foreign, financial and economic policies. He holds the view that national sovereignties should merge into one international sovereignty. Otherwise, a highly mechanised despotism will single out and annihilate the small nation-states.

We can understand Mr. Lionel Curtis when he says that Mr. Streit's scheme should be welcomed and assisted but he sadly betrays a lack of judgment when he remarks "Mr. Streit's *Union Now* appeared too late to stop the headlong drift towards war."¹ In another volume we have shown how this book is disappointing even as a discussion of guiding principles apart from the specific problems of adjustment.² According to Mr. Curtis the great contribution which British experience has to offer the world is that no attempt should be made to assimilate one nation by another. Could historical facts be muddled more completely?

The thesis of Lionel Curtis is that to foster in men a desire to serve each other is the end and object of human existence.³ The drama of the world is the story of the gradual discovery that men grow to perfection in so far as they base their relations on the infinite duty of each to all. Men rise in stature, power and understanding in proportion to their awareness of their unity and identity with other men.

He maintains that the only form which can accomplish men's being is the Sermon on the Mount translated into political terms. Any political mechanism should be designed entirely to provide the utmost freedom and opportunity to the individual to develop his sense of community and common interest with the mankind. It must be based upon the direct participation and responsibility of the individual himself. It should be a commonwealth in that sense, and the perpetual striving and ultimate ends cannot be anything but the Commonwealth of the World. One purpose, one interest and one loyalty, the brotherhood of man, is the only goal that enlists the life forces of the youth of the world. Curtis believes that any steps towards a World Commonwealth should be gradual and gradug.

¹ Lionel Curtis, *Decision*, p. 63.

² Y. G. Krishnamurti, *Constituent Assembly and Indian Federation*, 1940.; Jawaharlal Nehru: *The Man and his Ideas*, 1942.

³ Lionel Curtis, *Civitas Dei*, 1938; *Decision*, 1941; *Action*, 1941.

A system based on compact between sovereign states is inorganic, and therefore unstable, while a system becomes organic when its authority is based on the loyalty of the individuals of which it is composed, and when it exercises that authority direct on those individuals. The lesson of history is the inorganic bond of alliance hastens defeat or delays victory. And this is for two reasons. The decisions required to meet changing conditions, which will lead to recurrence of war, can seldom be made because such decisions require agreement between separate sovereignties. The second reason is that, as interests change, so the basis of compact changes.

M. Daladier remarked that the French and the British people think and act as one. Elated by this utterance Mr. Chamberlain declared that there could be no more helpful assurance for their common victory, and no more fruitful basis of a lasting peace because the intimate understanding which had grown up between them should not be terminated when the war was over. Churchill's offer of a Franco-British Union at the twelfth hour was quite dramatic but it could not have availed to prevent the recrudescence of German aggression unless the French and British peoples could have been put into a position to pursue one foreign policy for generations. To achieve this policy it had to be backed up by one Franco-British Army, Navy and Air Force. The question of dividing the costs, to obtain the necessary votes, would have proved a great obstacle.

No Franco-British Executive recruited from French and British Cabinets, and responsible to the French Chamber and the House of Commons, could have long survived. For such a system to work at all there must have been a Franco-British representative body directly elected by French and British voters. Then it would have been organic, and therefore stable. An inorganic structure is like a reed, which breaks when someone leans on it; but is yet strong enough to pierce the side with the broken end. So China, Abyssinia, Czechoslovakia, Albania and Finland found when they leaned on collective security.

There are about sixty sovereign states. Stability can now be introduced into this chaotic structure little by little, and only, at the outset, by bringing two or more states into organic union, and including others as they come to see that organic union is the only basis of international stability and peace. The

organic union should be limited as closely as possible to security. The power to control migration and tariff should be left to the national governments of the component states. National states must continue to discharge a permanent and necessary function in human affairs. A people cannot control their own social structure unless they control the distribution of taxation and the development of industries. The international government must be restricted to security for which purpose it must have effective power to make security a first charge on all the resources of the nations included.

The practical suggestion of Curtis is that the experiment be tried by Australia or New-Zealand or both, in combination with the United Kingdom. This formula for the first attempt is (i) a legislature elected by and responsible to the people, (ii) having fixed authority over peace or war and foreign affairs and (iii) having power to levy taxes directly on the people. The essence of the idea is that the new international commonwealth should extend a standing invitation to join, to all others who share the same purpose and beliefs.

G. D. H. Cole's conception of a new European Order is a supra-national state.¹ He suggests that Europe's atomism must give place to supra-national economic order. National aspirations should be reconciled with the over-whelming need for supra-national unity. And any attempt to restore the pre-war states with their narrow economic nationalism and capitalist basis would lead to futile and uncreative independence. In a capitalist civilization there is high individual output and low collective output, restricted by monopoly, and in such a structure unemployment becomes not an epidemic disease but something endemic. Capitalism creates economic instruments which are quite beyond the power of our democratic instruments to control. Further centralised planning and control are indispensable, in some measure, for twentieth century society that is to rest on a firm basis.

The post-war planners must think in terms of revolution and thus lift the powers of the people to high levels of constructive achievement. The Versailles Treaty tore up states which were single economic units into separate fragments disregarding the complex structure of production and exchange. Therefore, Mr. Cole contends that the establishment of supra-national states

¹ G. D. H. Cole, *Europe, Russia and the Future*, 1941.

on a basis of cultural self-determination can be the only working frame. A common basis of economic and social institutions for the constituent units is a desideratum. According to him, after the war there will be three distinct supra-national state systems in Europe : (a) an enlarged Soviet Union in the East and the South, (b) a new West European States bloc comprising Scandinavia, Holland, Belgium, France, Spain, Portugal, Switzerland and Italy and (c) a New Central European State consisting of Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland and Balkan countries. It is quite on the cards that Great Britain, with the British Dominions, instead of entering into a supra-national state system will be an economic and political satellite of the United States.

Mr. Cole feels that India in itself is a supra-national area. In the long run she is destined to be the centre of a mighty supra-national state covering the whole of the Middle East, and lying between a Sino-Japanese Far Eastern Soviet Republic, a new Eastern State based on Egypt, Turkey and Arabia, and the Soviet Union to the north.

The revolution he contemplates aims at successful planning for plenty, which requires large areas over which concerted plans can be developed. The supra-national state he envisages must be subject to a common economic plan, a common currency, and must have for concerted use the sources of raw materials, man-power and accumulated capital. The plan should be directed at improving the quality of agriculture, finding better markets, developing local industries and restoring the mobility of the peasant populations. Production should be based on human need and not on a prospect of profit. A machinery for an effective and fair exchange of agricultural surpluses for industrial surpluses should be developed.

Capitalism has an inherent tendency towards restriction and monopoly. Its essential features are that the main instruments of production and exchange are owned and managed by a small group to work for it under contract for a wage. A better world can be created with the Soviet as the instrument of social change. If the socialist solution is rejected the alternative will be a system akin to fascism or a kind of international feudalism under American leadership.

Professor H. J. Laski observes that every great reform in war-time is not only a mark of our faith in the principles we

fight, but also a compulsion to others to recognise the reality of our faith.¹ So, this dramatic opportunity must be used to lay the foundations of a new social order. The revolutionary dynamic of democracy should be evoked as the instrument of victory. The members of the international order should abandon their claim to sovereignty, and agree that all matters of common concern shall be matters also of common decision. Tariffs, currency, aviation, migration, the standards of labour, the right of access to raw materials and the use of colonial possessions are matters of common concern in which no state can exercise sovereign powers. Something like an international writ of *habeas corpus* must be established. And these principles must be incorporated into the peace settlement. Whatever the form of constitution in any state, its essential institutions must not violate the tested procedures of freedom.

Britain cannot come to the peace conference with clean hands while India is a plaintiff before the bar of history demanding independence. Professor Laski argues that political wisdom consists in making the historically possible the historically inevitable. The best proof of social justice is the power to embark on great reforms and the best hour for embarkation is always when crisis has opened men's minds and hearts to the necessity for great adventure.

"Balbus" envisages a co-operative European organism, composed of free and equal units, functioning on common values.² To achieve definitive peace, he recommends two phases of reconstruction—*first*, the phase of making good or to repair war damage to the essential organs of European life; and *secondly*, the phase of development, or to prevent another recurrence of economic insecurity and misery. Only a quadrilateral relation between countries of different industrial types and levels will lead to permanent stability. According to this arrangement Britain and Belgium will concentrate on specialised industry and with an agriculture devoted to protective food-stuffs; countries like the United States will be exporting low-grade agricultural products and heavy capital investment; peasant regions like the South East Europe will concentrate on high-grade agriculture and unspecialised industry and colonies and similar undeveloped areas will furnish tropical raw materials, while making a beginning with local secondary industries.

1 H. J. Laski, "The Need for a European Revolution," *Programme for Victory*, 1941.

2 "Balbus," *Reconstruction and Peace*, 1941.

Reconstruction should be used as a stepping-stone to peaceful stability. To restore the machinery of living which has knocked itself to pieces is an urgent need. The incorporation of raw materials on a strict scheme of priorities must be planned. Finance must adjust itself to the basic realities of needs, materials and man-hours. The Lease and Lend principle shows how it can adjust itself to these same realities in international relations. Therefore, needs and productive capacity and not finance are primary.

A trans-national structure for European heavy industry will not be anti-national, but it will be anti-nationalist. First, a Commission should be appointed to survey and decide provisionally on the number and boundaries of the industrial regions which it proposes to recognise. It will deal only with Regional Industrial Associations and allocate raw materials to leading industrialists, through these associations. National feelings and cultural self-determination must play a vital role.

Some suggestions are put forward regarding the status of Germany in the reconstructed Europe. One section suggests the assignment of the fragmented body of the Reich to other national units and the other recommends the keeping of the Germans in a position of inferiority. "Balbus" contends that reparation will be made by delaying the re-establishment of peace-time standards in Germany.

A Raw Materials Union should be established, with control boards for each commodity. The general lines of policy in relation to the balance between the various materials controlled will be the concern of the Union. It will in its turn be subordinate to the central political authority where economic policy has broad political reactions. The organisation will have two separate functions; the one, positive and economic, the other negative and political, concerned with enforcing a form of sanctions. The duty of applying sanctions when instructed to do so by the competent judicial or political authority should be written into the Charter or Constitution of the Raw Materials Union and its constituent controls. An International Force empowered to employ the essential instruments of modern war should be organised.

"Balbus" emphasises the point that the transition from war to reconstruction and from reconstruction to true peace can be

made with a minimum of dislocation if immediate urgencies and long-term development are kept in mind.

Dr. Benes has offered for discussion a draft of a scheme for the post-war organisation of Europe.¹ The most helpful symptom of the present is that statesmen are beginning to turn towards the nature of the peace that will follow the cessation of hostilities. This elder statesman points out that the first thing to be secured in the new post-war organisation of Europe must be a permanent and general equilibrium. The equilibrium must be based politically and economically upon the balance of forces between a number of large political units. He suggests that the Franco-British relations should be properly regulated. Germany should become a decentralised confederation. Prussia should be broken into three or four separate units. The participation in the Nazi imperialist venture will leave Italy broken and bankrupt. Central Europe should be recognised and its core should be a Czechoslovak-Polish confederation. The internal conditions will determine Austria, Hungary and Rumania joining this bloc. The Balkan Bloc should consist of a confederation between Jugoslavia, Greece and Albania and possibly Rumania.

He emphasises that a post-war plan to which Russia is not a party would be no plan at all. Therefore, she must take part in the organisation of Europe and in the future co-operation of the new European blocs. Dr. Benes observes that the continued disequilibrium caused by the isolation of Russia was one of the reasons for the second World War. His scheme provides for the creation of a larger Scandinavian political unit in the north of Europe, in agreement with Great Britain and America. Spain and Portugal should decide their future status themselves.

His view about the position of Germany in the new design is not dictated by Germanophobia. The obvious course for her is to return to the pre-war Munich frontiers. She will be compelled to evacuate Austria, which she annexed by the threat of force. He sees little difficulty in organising the west of Europe. The democracy of France was rotten and corrupt and it destroyed itself. It was responsible for her Bonnets Daladiers and her eventual and tragic fall. It is impossible as yet in what pattern a new Central European Bloc formed. The war will conclude with profound revol

¹ Edward Benes, "The Organisation of Post-War Europe," *Foreign Affairs*, January 1945.

disturbances and they will be most radical especially in Central Europe.

A crucial aim of this war is to develop a new form of democracy. The situation will be unfavourable either politically or psychologically, for the re-establishment in any free and peaceful manner, of a great and unified monarchy in Europe. The first requisite for the rebuilding of a Central European Bloc is mutual confidence. Another is that all the partners shall have an approximately similar political structure. The new federal institutions will spring from the democratisation of Central Europe, not its consolidation on old monarchical bases, which had a long test and failed so signally. The self-evident democratic postulate is that the nations of Central Europe must decide their fate after the war themselves.

Every Central European state has its minorities and some of them are an international menace. In certain cases it will be necessary to undertake the transference of minority populations. Herr Hitler himself has adopted this policy and transferred German minorities from the Baltic and from Tyrol. Dr. Benes asked us to believe that every nation in Central Europe would feel it right and proper to punish severely those members of its minorities who in these terrible years have been guilty of treachery, espionage, murder and mass-looting under the auspices of the German armies. By the same principle every state will punish its own Quislings. The states will make sure that their minorities would no longer aim a revolver against their national existence. But the political and cultural rights of loyal minorities must be guaranteed on the basis of absolute mutuality.

He lays down three general principles for solving the minority problem. *First*, after the war it will be impossible to create states which are nationally homogeneous. *Secondly*, it will be necessary after this war to carry out a transfer of populations on a very much larger scale than after the last war. It must be done in as human a manner, internationally organised and internationally financed. *Lastly*, the protection of minorities in the future must consist primarily in the defence of human democratic rights and not of national rights. Minorities in individual states must never again be given the character of internationally recognised political and legal units, with the possibility of again becoming sources of disturbance.

The creation of larger federal blocs will also facilitate the solution of post-war economic problems. Post-war planned economy will develop best in wider frame-works, than in the narrow confines of small states. The economic sovereignty of states must be rigidly limited after the war. German economic penetration was a prelude to military penetration. The same economic policy was carried out on a smaller scale by Fascist Italy in Central Europe and the Balkans. Even as a bloc, Central Europe will not be economically self-sufficient and an economic exchange with other blocs will be necessary. But fundamental rationalisation and a sensible division of work are required for them to effect exchanges with one another with a minimum strain upon transport.

Political democracy demands a thorough going economic democracy. Problems of employment and agrarian reform can be best coped with in supra-national units. Larger structural changes in the economic order will be inevitable after this war. The blind selfishness of the individual states caused Europe to slide down the inclined plane which led to the present catastrophe.

The establishment of a true reign of law between the nations is the only remedy for war. A federal plan is necessary and a co-operative system must prepare the way for it and later to be transformed into it. The question of the character of the ultimate general settlement is a moral question. The choice of the way must be determined by the strength of the will.

Otto Strasser conjures up fascinating pictures of a minority in Germany ready to transform passive discontent into political action.¹ The general atmosphere there discloses all the features that make revolution possible. The Hitler system which has brought about civil war in Europe has tightened up the screw-press of terrors. Two million Germans are in concentration camps or penitentiaries. Men meditate on the horrors of inflation which robbed them of wages, savings and profits, while thrifty housewives have been gravely discomfited by the scarcity of essential articles of diet, of foot-wear and of clothing. The egoism of the Prussian generals exceeds their loyalty. The General Staff clamoured for a pact with Russia. If Hitler's ruin is imminent they would seize any chance of saving themselves by sacrificing the Chancellor and his paladins. If the Black

¹ Otto Strasser, *Germany Tomorrow*, 1940.

Front group, the Socialist group and the Army group are fused together, the anti-Hitler revolution will materialise. The heart and mind of the German is drugged and his allegiance is divided between moral duty and national duty.

The teaching of history, observes Otto Strasser, points to the possibility of a durable peace in Europe. Wars are the struggles of growth among the nations. The close of this ripening process necessarily involves the disappearance of intra-European imperialism. That the disintegration of Germany creates and stabilises peace is a crazy idea. For, as soon as the palsy of war is over, the will-to-freedom and the will-to-equal-rights will return. With the rejection of a Carthaginian peace the alternative is to take guarantees from Germany for the security of her neighbours.

The development of Little Brandenburg into Great Prussia represents the growth of a cancer which must be checked if Germany and Europe are to be saved. Refusing to merge but willing to federate is a fundamental principle of the German organisation. The German Reich should be reorganised into a league of substantially independent cantons. The social power of Prussia is based upon squirearchy, the power of the Junkers who number 18,168. Their expropriation should be effected without compensation, in favour of self-governing economic corporations. The New Order must aim at the deproletarianisation of the people and liberation from social and economic monopolies under whose harrow no sort of freedom is possible.

Dr. Strasser dislikes the starveling make-believe of political democracy. He admits that fundamental democratization is necessary for intra-European collaboration. He talks pointedly of the elimination of all parties and the inauguration of a democracy of the councils and the estates which can create the new form of democracy. Self-government by the states and their direct control of the administration is his solution. A system of popular representation based upon direct and indirect elections, representing in the councils economic interests and in the vocational estates popular interests is the only way of avoiding the return of Nazi or Bolshevik party movements.

Otto Strasser has explained and restored to favour the principle that if Germany should be honestly animated by the constructive will to upbuild a New Germany and make a voluntary

contribution to New Europe, then the peace must be a just peace. He links the long-term influence of the Schleicher-Strasser-Leipart front and the German revolutionary government that will overthrow Hitler and create the New Germany. Germany after Hitler should proclaim the right of the Austrian people to decide its own future by means of plebiscite, cure the open sore between Germanism and Slavism and pay war indemnity to Poland.

He puts forward the sincere and seemingly valid argument that this war is a war of religions in which the adversaries are not nations but groups of zealots. This is typical of civil wars. As an analyst of the more abiding aspects of German life, the strength and weakness of the Third Reich, Dr. Strasser has many merits. But he has nothing new to say on points of fact regarding the Union of European States except that it must be voluntary and the candidate state must be subject to the reign of law. It must recognise the arbitral powers of the federation. The most decisive guarantee of general security will be a general agreement to disarm. Parliamentary irresponsibility will be a fit forcing ground for Lavals and Doriots. The systematised and gloating evil of the dictatorial system will corrupt the human soul. Therefore, a system of aristocratic responsibility must be created.

The mutations of the west as determined by the eternal law of growing order and by the rhythmic change in ideas will have a decisive influence on Christianity. Political and economic structural changes in the west will create massive changes in its religious and cultural forms. The proclamation of the freedom of faith and conscience should be usefully supplemented by a recognition of the freedom of art and science. The New Order must stand for national freedom, social justice and European collaboration. In Germany, a *elite* of the German people, a class of "Knights" should be created. This violent act is not the beginning but the end of the revolution, the end of the reconstruction of the feelings, the thoughts and the will of the Germans.

(2)

WORLD UNIONS

The major Prophet, Mr. H. G. Wells says that this war is incidental but the need for revolutionary reconstruction is

fundamental.¹ Collective world control to eliminate warfare and collective control of the economic and biological life of mankind are aspects of one and the same process. Of the two the breakdown of the ordinary life is the graver and the less reversible. Both arise out of the abolition of distance and the change of scale, they affect and modify each other, and unless their parallelism and interdependence are recognised, any projects for world federation are doomed inevitably to frustration.

Humanity is at the end of an age, an age of fragmentation in the management of its affairs, fragmentation politically among separate sovereign states and economically among unrestricted business organisations competing for profit.² Therefore, we have to devise a collectivism that neither degrades nor enslaves.

In an excellent discussion of universal wrong-thinking, Mr. Wells shows that it is a world revolution that is upon us, that all roads lead to socialism or social dissolution and that in this struggle to evoke world socialism contemporary governments may vanish like straw-hats in the rapids of Niagara. There may be a relapse into barbarism but somewhen and somehow, man must recover.

A revolution, says Mr. Wells, need neither be an explosion nor a *coup d'etat*. The first is too rhetorical and leads to a champion and tyranny. The second is too conspiratorial and leads to a similar end. Neither is lucid enough and deliberate enough to achieve an enduring change in the form and texture of human affairs. Therefore, the new revolution should aim at a change in directive ideas.

The triangle of Law, Collectivism and Knowledge should embody the common purpose of mankind. It should frame the revolution which may yet save the world. As our breed is still "childishly wicked" and as things are more highly collectivised the more necessary is a legal system embodying the Rights of Man.

The Charter should provide a structural defence between the citizen and the inevitable growth of central authority. A New

¹ H. G. Wells, *The New World Order*, 1940; *Guide to the New World: A Handbook of Constructive World Revolution*, 1941.

² "It is the system of nationalist individualism and unco-ordinated enterprise that is the world's disease, and it is the whole system that has to go. It has to be reconditioned down to its foundations or replaced. It cannot hope to 'muddle through' amiably, wastefully and dangerously, a second time."

(H. G. Wells, *The New World Order*, p. 17.)

Declaration of the Rights of Man must become the common fundamental law of all humanities and collectivities held together under the world *Pax*. Mr. Wells urges that it should be interwoven with the declared war aims of the warring nations now. It should include the general goodwill of mankind from pole to pole and assure a man the proper fulfilment of all his basic needs in kind, and nothing more. In the words of William James, it should at once give him a personal obligation to the world state and personal ownership in it.

According to Mr. Purdom, to construct nations and institutions through individuals on the basis of *function*, defining and declaring their ends, is the creative act of the New Order. The term "New Order"¹ is not a Nazi invention but belongs to "the prophetic soul of mankind." The war has upset everything and this upset is permanent. Our individuals and national aims have to be reversed, so that what we have sought hitherto we seek no more. Our hearts' desire of a new way of life should be seized out of the hidden future. The inherent contradictions of our society—poverty and plenty, liberty and authority, freedom and planning, nationalism and world order, and war and peace must be resolved. Only intelligence intensified in creative frenzy can raise our human fate from inevitable disaster to the realm of order.

Mr. Purdom's logic is unassailable when he argues that the present war will end when the spiritual conditions of which it is the symptom are remedied. These conditions are lack of conviction and the paralysis of uncertainty in the souls of individual men. The citizen of the New Order "does not first look to other leaders, but to himself, to alliance with others who also depend on themselves and to God. To him everything is possible."

Mr. Purdom attaches singular importance to the functional principle. He understands the human race to be a single human family, and the human social organism to be the organisation of the human household. His conception of the New Order is a structure of social organs possessing specific functions, which are fused into unity and become a whole. On the functional

¹ C. B. Purdom, *The New Order*, p. 247, 1941.

See also Leon Duguit, *Law in the Modern State*, 1921 ;
Reinhold Niebuhr, *Moral man and Immoral Society*, 1933 ;
Reflections on the End of an Era, 1934.

Salvador de Madariaga, *Anarchy and Hierarchy*, 1937 ;

Ramiro de Maeztu, *Authority, Liberty and Function in the Light of the War*, 1916.


principle no organ dominates the body, each has its defined sphere of activity, which has relation to the whole, and has no value apart from that relation. In other words, the structure and organisation of one part of the system depends upon the needs of the other parts.

"By art," said Hobbes, "is created a Commonwealth." The art of human social ordering is the creation of a mechanism in which the balance of social organs is maintained, and the interests of the community are preserved. Function means active relation to the purpose for which a thing exists. The Spanish writer de Maetzu found in the idea of fuction "a social order without the need of a soul power." Men in society, he declared, have need of the same thing, therefore, they associate for the realisation of that thing.


Every association is brought into existence because of some end that the members propose to themselves. This relation of the members of an association to the proposed end is their function and the duty of membership to fulfil the function. The association and its members are instruments to its end. The rights of man are not, therefore, inherent or natural, but arise from functionings; "no function, no rights." de Maetzu argued that no association can claim absolute jurisdiction over us. It follows that except as to its function, no association possesses sovereignty. He distinguished between final values and instrumental values. Final values are the goods in themselves; instrumental values are tools for the production of final values. In this sense, man and the state are instrumental values. And men find their ultimate ends not in themselves, but in their functions. The end of man transcends his personality and it is in the glory of God. Nor does the state embody final values, they are in the sphere of culture.

The problem of sovereignty can be solved only by the functionalization of the national structure. Internationally, there will be no organ with absolute jurisdiction, only authority within functional institutions. The creation of functional organs within the nation and the abrogation of sovereignty will heal the division between liberty and authority, man and society. In a functional society, the risk of rebellion is minimised through the variety of duties defined and recognised. Its parts being vitally organic are firmly integrated. These myriad functional responsibilities will promote social solidarity.

SUPRA-NATIC



AL UNIONS



A new social conscience should be developed in which the individual and institutions will be subject to constant challenge. Mr. Reinhold Niebhur has pointed out that associations do not behave as do individuals but he provides the explanation when he says: "The group becomes unmoral not so much because of the absence of power to enforce its laws, but because those laws are forgotten, and the reason for the existence of the group is obscured by the attempt to make it serve some other objects than those for which it was formed." The association to be stable must have clearly defined aims, recognise the social value of its goal and maintain the balance of organs. If the meaning of life is realised only in association it will gain a new vigour and purpose in the functional society.

According to Mr. Purdom "World Order" means the world as a single nation. It will be strongest culturally, the most fully organised economically and the most lightly felt politically. It will not be a world super-state, nor a world government, nor an overriding authority dominating the nations. On the contrary, it will have no governmental functions, no coercive powers, and will not be a world super-state, nor a world government, nor a sovereignty which elsewhere had withered away.

The four forms of world co-operation which can usher in the New World Order are in the spheres of (1) religion (2) education (3) law and (4) planning. Religion is the field of deepest conflicts. Scientific synthesis should take the place of the present religious leadership. Religion, says Mr. Purdom, "is human will warmed by emotion, inspiring the prophets, who, with science as their method, announce the transformation from age to age of mankind and the world." Without a religious background, education lacks meaning. The spiritual law of tolerance demands the unity of religions. The significance of Christianity as a religion is that "it declares that the world is worth saving." All human issues are co-ordinated in religion and it must by a sublime act of reconciliation represent the unity of the human species.

The object of education in the New World Order should be to see that every child has the same vision of the world with its own local cultural pattern. Kant's ideal of "a long and intensive education of the spirit for all citizens in every country" should be realised. To achieve this purpose all national cultural organs should unite. The world law should define the relations

between men for harmonious living together. It shall root out slavery and all relationships allied to slavery. A world-court should be set up, composed of the judges of greatest eminence in all nations, to sit at the Hague, to adjudicate on world disputes and to apply the principles of world law. Through world law the liberties of mankind must be assured.

World planning will be a social activity with civic and cultural aspects. It will be composed of every nation. It will examine facts, provide methods of co-operation, suggest lines of development, indicate trends, and act as a source of light and guidance so that nothing need be done in ignorance. The civic element in planning will be concerned with the movements of population, migration and the people of empty spaces. The scope of the new world economy will include the maintenance of a world price structure between nations and a stable world money. Its working principles will be established within the two-fold aims of how to achieve abundance and how to distribute it. Crystallisation of planning is necessary, but equally necessary is its neutralisation, which is possible by keeping it under constant revision. Economic planning must be subject to cultural security.

The organs of the New World Order will be established by the states of the world, as those states organise themselves on the functional principle. The parliaments of the nations will make the necessary agreements between each other, and political, economic and cultural unions will be created, each autonomous in its own sphere. The World Union and States will be federal in structure and it will set up the following institutions: The World Court, The World Defence Commission and The World Political Planning Commission. The World Cultural Union will be the federal union of the cultural chambers of the world. It will set up institutions, among them the following: The World Commission for Religions, The World Commission of Science and The World Cultural Planning Commission.

The conception of a New World Order is the affirmation of man's conviction that he can control his destiny. The awakening of the individual responsibility and the identification of the individual with the common interests of mankind are necessary. The acceptance of specious lies will be ended, the tolerance of

incompetence will cease and the nervelessness of men who are afraid will be over.

Duncan and Elizabeth Wilson say that the struggle between fascism and democracy is not one of ideologies.¹ And that is where at present fascism has an immense advantage. The democrat should decide what he is going to fight for, not only what he is going to fight against. An international federation is a logical half-way house between international anarchy, tempered by alliances and leagues, and the kind of super-state which would completely wipe out the present division of Europe into nations.

Federation is the form of union which combines best the executive strength of a single whole with the retention of liberty by its national constituent parts. The crux of the matter is not political difficulties but the renunciation of economic nationalism. A major problem bearing on the transition from national economic system to an international economic plan would be the conciliation and co-operation of the numerous professional and business interest affected by the change. A federal union will result in an increase of security and the rational use of its economic resources. But the costs of transition from a national to an international system should make a realist pause, and pause for fairly long time.

We have drawn attention to nearly a dozen of these schemes put forward on the basis of limited unions and world union. A majority of these contemporary thinkers, however bitterly they may dispute with each other about methods and policies, profess similar standards of value and are in harmony as to the ultimate ends. They desire individual and national rights within a frame-work of obligations, economic security and justice and civil and international peace. They all agree that the age of absolutist tendencies, collateral developments and compensatory expedients is over. The task of a progressive movement for world reconstruction is, therefore, to find a programme by which these ideals may be realised and which is capable of winning the support of a majority of the peoples of the world.

The capacity of a constructive revolution will be diminished if there is discrepancy between means and ends. To such a cause nebulous and negative War Aims must be regarded as a liability

1 Duncan and Elizabeth Wilson, *Federation and World Order*, 1940.

rather than an asset. The ideology which dominates the left-wing movement is socialism. The privileged groups, opposed to fundamental changes, are frightened into the Fascist camp. The question presents itself, whether it is wiser to circumvent a hostile combination of forces or to meet it in open combat. The several planning "experts" have attempted a solution of this dilemma which confronts us. Reason may make us sceptical or hesitant; but with the eye of faith, as illumined by the achievements of history, we can view the future with confidence.

In England a semi-official company of experts are producing a continuing series of tentative plans. They have no conclusions but they have formulated certain principles. They discard any future combination of peoples or governments based upon common speech, economic interest or geographical proximity. The test they have arrived at is that any new union should be composed of people who believe in the same human values. Their plans are based upon religious sanctions and not upon material considerations. According to them the purposes of any Union are four (i) upholding freedom of thought, expression of opinion and movement (ii) upholding the rule of law, both nationally and internationally (iii) the use of the state as an instrument of public welfare and cultural development and (iv) the organisation of production and distribution for raising the standard of living of the people. They contend that a union for these purposes must be a growth and not an immediate performance.

As a basis they expect the amalgamation of the English and French peoples. Delegating authority to a supreme council, pooling financial resources and establishing a joint buying commission, a single military command and a common centre for training pilots are some of the measures recommended. All English plans propose to carry out a remodelled League of Nations. But one cannot graph the future by simply prolonging the lines indicated by a crisis psychology. These plans overlook two important considerations: *first*, it is impossible to secure a measure of economic justice within the capitalist frame-work and *secondly*, any palliative to blunt the edges of man's indignation will prove futile.

It is a well-attested fact that the sovereign state is an anachronism. The history of the past twenty years has knocked the bottom out of the view that sovereignty is an essential attribute

of statehood. Mr. Wells makes a swift exposure of the nation-states when he says "the whole intellectual life of mankind revolts against this intolerable, suffocating, murderous nuisance, the obsolescent nation-state." Mr. Curtis has a gnawing doubt that the attempt to supersede the anarchic nation-state is likely to fail. He observes "I believe that the power to control migration and tariffs can and should be left to the national governments of the component states." Then his commonwealth of God is the merest mysticism.

The New Order will come about and maintain itself so long as an established political government is in a position to give expression to the need for that unity and support it with the force of law. Social values should be the instrument on which this new structure should rest. Policies which are planned in terms not of overthrowing capitalism but of improving it cannot bring about a more equitable social order. The dependencies are insisting on the full and immediate realisation of political equality and freedom and once the demand is conceded they will become the bulwarks of the New Order. A further extension of state ownership and regulation will develop among the industrial workers a sense of comradeship, a consciousness of belonging to the same community and a feeling of self-sacrificing heroism. This radical and peaceful change will be the embryo of the new co-operative society that would be created after the war. Therefore, limited unions on the capitalistic basis as envisaged by some "experts" will acquire sinister tendencies.

Professor Keeton is bright-minded enough to conceive an Anglo-American Bloc and Mr. Clarence Streit has become more American in his glib plea for Union Now with America. The curious thing is that they do not lay emphasis on propaganda to translate the federal ideas into conscious will and purpose. On the other hand they hope that the promptings of fear may force their acceptance of the federal solution. It is stimulating to read the proposals of Miss Barbara Ward and Mr. Leonard Woolf for a transition period from war to the definite peace settlement.

Dr. Benes' principle of the balance of power is difficult to reach and preserve, because every one of the powers inevitably aspires to hegemony. Its duration cannot be prolonged beyond the limits of its own spontaneity. Dr. Strasser's conception of aristocratic responsibility and the creation of a class of "knights"

will only lead to tyranny. If the feudal survivals are bolstered up then freedom will be in danger. The supra-national state of Mr. Cole and the co-operative European organism of "Balbus" must become the nucleus of a Co-operative Commonwealth.

Nationalism is a retrograde and dying force and national one-sidedness is intolerable. In the words of Dante. "To imagine that there is a goal for this nation or that nation, and not for all nations taken together, is absurd." Efficient planning of the economy of the entire world, subjection of all races and nationalities to a single international control, equalisation of living standards, equality and free co-operation: this is what a Co-operative Commonwealth would involve. The only method of achieving international harmony is to weaken the authority of the national state and to strengthen the liberties of the individual.

If socialism moves towards world unity, capitalism moves away from it. Capitalism has created its own grave-diggers—national separatism, misery, exploitation and slavery. It is argued that a Nazi state wages war to protect the Aryan race while a Socialist state intervenes to protect the proletariat. Even then, unlike fascism, socialism accepts war as a means to an end; it does not glorify war as good in itself. The reason for expecting the Co-operative Commonwealth to be peaceful is that its ideology will be pacifistic.

In such a rational well-ordered society anarchy in social production will be replaced by conscious organisation on a planned basis. The conditions of existence which have hitherto dominated man will pass under the dominion of man. The change will not simply mean Stalin stepping aside in favour of Harry Pollit or Sir Stafford Cripps, but it will be "humanity's leap from the realm of necessity to the realm of freedom." Professor Joad feels that world union may not be achieved by this civilization at all. It is more than rhetorical aspiration when he pleads that it, however, serves as a cause for which to work and a light by which to live.¹

1 C. E. M. Joad, *Journey Through the War Mind*, 1940.

7

A NEW ECONOMIC ORDER

THE THREE tendencies that were at the root of the nineteenth century civilization were liberal democracy, national self-determination and *laissez-faire* economics. They had their faults and limitations, power of illusion, prosperity and charm. The Russian Revolution made liberal democracy rock on its foundations. The inner dynamic of National Socialism turned the right of National self-determination into a supra-national movement. While paying lip-service to the principle of *laissez-faire*, its chief exponents adopted expédients as a distasteful necessity. The regulation and organisation of national economic life by the states for the needs of the community made its first appearance in states of the dissatisfied powers. The satisfied or conservative powers forfeited the initiative in the political and economic spheres.

In Great Britain and the United States absolute validity was given to out-moded economic doctrines. Mr. G. Crowther rightly points out that Dr. Shacht's true greatness resides in the realisation of the fact that in economics few doctrines are right at all times.¹ The pursuit of individual interests as the motive force of the economic system is now a bankrupt ideology. The hypothesis of a vast society of independent, mobile individuals is falsified. There is a bias to control and co-ordinate the activities of the interest-groups in the interest of the community.

The social conscience bitterly resents the view that the end of economic activity is to mass-produce cheap goods, which can be sold as dearly as possible. The price and profit mechanism as a normal test of economic policy is discarded.² The free-moving, self-adjusting, perfectly sensitive competitive capitalism has vanished for ever. The world demand for different types of

1 G. Crowther, *Ways and Means of War*, p. 84.

2 People have come to regard the profit motive as a central and immutable feature of human nature. It is merely an example of the way in which, as Professor Dewey has said, "our social tendencies are read back into the structure of human nature, and are then used to explain the very things from which they are deduced." (*Freedom and Culture*, p. 108).

goods and services witnessed a radical change. The sales resistance was broken by skilful advertising technique. Many governments subsidised the producers to produce goods which they later on paid them to destroy. In some of the highly civilized countries, wheat and cotton were ploughed in, coffee was burnt, live-stock slaughtered and milk poured away.

The producing interests tried these wasteful methods of "price stabilisation" when millions were dying from hunger. The sensible policy was not to subsidize production but to subsidize consumption. The totalitarian states had the originality to adopt a programme of planned consumption. In Russia, the demand automatically outstripped supply in every field. The economic system of the dissatisfied powers subordinated the producer to the consumer. The substitution of welfare to wealth became the principal object. It taught the people the virtues of self-discipline and self-discrimination.

The totalitarian economic system first found expression in the writings of Karl Marx. Marx wrote "The emancipation of the German means the emancipation of mankind. Philosophy is the doctrine impulse of this emancipation; its life-blood is the proletariat." The chief object of Marx was to raise Germans from serfdom to freedom and to achieve a means for this purpose he discovered the proletariat. Ricardo discovered that the source of all values was the human capacity for work. Hegel believed in an increased spiritual progress that was in opposition to itself. He declared that out of the conflict of power with power an altogether new and third force was born. According to this dialectic method, thesis (middle-class society) must be over-come by the antithesis (proletariat) in order to pave the way for the new synthesis.¹ The materialist interpretation of history is the application of dialectical criticism to all aspects of human life. In Marx's system the working-class must strive for the realisation of a philosophy. In his view true democracy in a highly industrialized state can exist if the working-class assumes the leadership of the middle-class and the peasantry.

It will be interesting to note the origin of the concept of Bolshevism. It came into being as a result of the difference of opinion

¹ Marx in his preface to *Capital* said "he had merely turned Hegel's philosophy other side up." He thought that he had thus saved the "rational Kernel" and got rid of the "mystic shell."

See Max Eastman, *Marxism: is it Science?* 1941;

Henry Bamford Parker, *Marxism: A Post-Mortem*, 1940.

Engels, *Anti-Duhring*; T. A. Jackson, *Dialectics*; J. B. S. Haldane, *Marxist Philosophy and the Sciences*.

between Lenin and Mortov of the wording of paragraph I of the party rules. Lenin suggested "Any one is a member of the party who participates in the organisation of the party." Mortov made a counter-proposal which ran "Any one working under the supervision of the party is a member of the party." In the voting that followed Lenin obtained a majority. From that day onwards his supporters called themselves Majoritarians (Bolsheviks) while those of Mortov styled themselves Minoritarians (Mensheviks). A handful of Russian refugees in London thus made world history by their hair-splittings.

Democracy and socialism are threatened from everywhere by Nazis, Fascists, Plutocrats and all the lesser breeds of authoritarians. Democracy has forced on capitalism a new form, which has some, but not the essential features of socialism. It is "state-controlled, monopolistic, and still predominantly inequalitarian."¹ It has failed to reach a further stage demanded by democracy, namely, equality. This will be a combination of extended state control or socialism with democracy. In point of fact Lenin defined socialism as state control plus planning. It is only through democracy that it is possible to reach the just or egalitarian society of socialism. The individual psychology of aggression and co-operation has a decisive influence upon the dynamics of social, political and economic institutions.

An expansionist programme will pave the way for a full socialist programme. The plan should include low interest, public works, general social services and redistributive taxation. Expansionism must entail the control of the banking system and of foreign trade. It also requires a widening of the sphere of state-controlled investments.² And by providing some measures of social security it strengthens the bargaining powers of the workers. Precisely because it points in the directions of socialism, an expansionist programme will rouse the bitter opposition of the governing class. Its merit is it attacks capitalism at a point where it is least easy to defend. Yet expansionism in itself cannot create a stable system. Some form of thorough-going socialism is necessary.

British imperialism is a typical piece of British hypocrisy by which the British cover their determined exploitation of the subject races by a moral gloss of sentiments.³ It is true that the

¹ See E. F. M. Durbin, *The Politics of Democratic Socialism*, 1940.

² John Stratchey, *A Programme for Progress*, 1940.

³ Francis Williams, *Democracy's Last Battle*, p. 218, 1942.

British Empire exists like a coin with two sides. The symbol of democratic freedom is engraved on one side. But on the other the symbol of an old imperialism remains.

An instance how the power of phrases liquidates facts is the relationship between Britain and Dominions. Constitutional purists hold the opinion that the external symbols of sovereignty like secession and neutrality are non-existent in the case of the Dominions. Mr. Menzies rightly says "In spite of the theorists, the foreign policy of the British Commonwealth is to a large extent in the hands of the Foreign Secretary to Britain. The great issue of peace and war will be much more determined by the gentleman who sits in a room looking across the Horse Guards Parade, than it will be by my colleagues in Canberra, or one of our colleagues in Ottawa or in Pretoria."

Complacent imperialists who do lip-service to the democratic ideal boast of "our national heritage." Even the Labour Party in Britain has not professed any radical departure. The Liberals harp upon leading the backward people by easy stages to assured independence. The colonies came into the hands of the imperialists by conscious design and premeditated garb. The plea that the imperial authority enjoys a measure of real consent of the colonial peoples will only raise a smile. In truth the imperial authority is unwholesomely suffused by a lively bureaucratic tradition and is wielded by self-assured officers.

The British "way" with the dependent people has lost its charm. The criticism that colonies cannot stand alone reflects obstructive and wrong-headed thinking. To say that parliamentary procedure is unsuited to the Eastern mind is to get one's imagination back to a primitive mentality.

The colonies are a composite of many distinct tribes and peoples, conscious of their separateness, and often unable to communicate with their own neighbours except through the medium of some foreign language like English, Arabic, Hansa or Swahili.

To the world opinion the British policy in India typifies British imperialism. The granting of Dominion Status is made dependent upon a prior achievement of Indian unity on a scale unnatural, if it were possible. Evidently, Britain is making use of inevitable differences in India in order to continue her over-lorship. Dr. Hugh Dalton says that the history of British

colonial administration is one of depression rather than of oppression. The colonies though sunk in poverty and squalor still represent on the aggregate a substantial market for British goods. India is the largest single market of British goods to which a tenth of Britain's total export trade goes in normal years. The undiluted Torrey faith was expressed by Lord Brentford when he said "I know that in missionary meetings it is said we conquered India to raise the level of Indians. That is cant. We conquered India as an outlet for the goods of Great Britain."

It is argued that imperialism offers substantial opportunities only to a minority. The British citizen gets little out of colonial imperialism except trouble and expense. Apart from the pickings secured by a minority exploiting groups, the advantage imperialism offers to a democracy is a myth. For imperialist exploitation of democracy breaks down just at the moment when it could become valuable. Then it is high time that Britain should "get India off her back." The Fourth-of-July sense of superiority over breeds of men which Amery & Co., frequently display, is a case of Imperialist faith degenerating into outright sham.

The partitioning of Africa by the European powers roused in many Americans a desire for an Empire. Captain A. T. Mahan wrote "Comparative religion teaches that creeds which reject missionary enterprise are fore-doomed to decay. May it not be so with nations? How much poorer the world would have been, had England heeded the cautious hesitancy that now bids us reject any advance beyond our shores." When McKinley annexed the Philippines, E. L. Gorkin said "God told Duty to tell Destiny to tell McKinley to take all islands." Americans soon realised that imperialism had been a mistake. The result of this policy has been condemned by an American historian¹ in 1927 as opportunist and based on "dollar diplomacy."

All the modern colonies are in the tropics. The relative success of few colonies and the Dominions has obscured the essentials of the more typical colonial problem. In the undeveloped colonies there is bush or prairie to be broken into

¹ "In about thirty years, we have created two new republics—Cuba and Panama; converted both of them and three other Latin American countries—the Dominican Republic, Nicaragua and Haiti—into virtual protectorates; intervened by force at least thirty times in the internal affairs of nine supposed sovereign and independent nations; made the period of intervention last anywhere from a few days to dozen years; enlarged our investments from a paltry two or three hundred millions of dollars to the tidy sum of upwards of three billions; and installed in four states our own collection of customs to insure payment."

agriculture, railways and roads to be built up and paid for, and social amenities to be provided. The tropical agricultural production is wasteful and unremunerative. The natural diet of the people is ill-balanced and deficient. There is an acute shortage of protective foods and staple crops. Latent malaria, hook-worm and deficiency skin diseases are common. In some districts in Africa a wheeled cart is unknown and the means of conveying goods is by headportorage. Nothing will serve in the colonies but the sustained drive to build up and develop simultaneously the three principal services health, education and agriculture. The tropics, it would be noted, call for a stand-up fight with Nature.

In the West Indies the slaves were emancipated in the heyday of *laissez-faire*. A handful of Negroes shared the better-schools of the white planters. A steadily mounting up coloured section claimed the rights of citizenship. The majority of the descendants of ex-slaves are now a half-starved landless proletariat. It is admitted that any remedy must include projects of social welfare. The West Indies protest is voiced by its own advanced members.

In South Africa it is with the help of native labour and at their expense, that the small white minority has won Dominion-hood and a high standard of living. The South African Union is a Dominion of a white democracy over a politically powerless black majority. The real cause for the conflict of interests is economic. The European settlers squeezed the natives out of their lands. The impoverished natives moved to urban centres of employment. For the same unskilled jobs the "poor whites" violently competed. It was the first duty of the white state to take a full quota of expensive white labour and keep in employment. As a safeguard the political power was retained in their hands. The colonising power was there ostensibly to enforce peace.

Mining is a regrettable necessity in these virgin communities. The mine's demand for labour has created a social disturbance. The social change involved is met by negative restrictions. The workers should be enabled to lead a normal life and have their wives and children with them. These mining towns present splendid opportunities for education and better living. But the bureaucracy would like to prevent the impact of change.

With the passing of the Victorian age the vision of a freer and fuller life also faded. The new theory evolved at the peace settlement of 1919 was that the weaker peoples are "a sacred trust of civilization." Practical assistance on the orthodox democratic tradition is now regarded as impolitic. The new departure is "Indirect Rule" promising local self-government by indigenous local authorities acting on the advice and under the general supervision of British officers. It sets out to humanize imperialism by delegating some authority to the native rulers.

This system has fundamental defects. The younger sections of the state have no rightful voice in formulating policies. To thrust new powers on a chief without popular control is to subject the masses to the caprice of an ignorant and reactionary over-lord. Says Professor Macmillan "Having lost faith in democracy ourselves we did, more or less consciously, design this system as an escape from the complications and dangers of popular government." It has failed to be the constructive force.

The Colonial Development and Welfare Act of 1940 provides for a new constructive policy of development and research by the grant of £5½ million a year for ten years. But still the Royal Commission is inclined to soft-pedal any suggestion for constitutional advance. The government's duty is to live up to its own earlier professions. Self-government should be the eventual and not too distant goal.

"Internationalization" owes its popularity to a consideration of the needs of Europe than for those of colonial democracy. The function of Internationalization will be protective and never creative.¹ This is the fatal flaw in the Mandate's system also. The chief work done by the Mandate's Commission of the League is of a supervisory nature. The imperialist authority can win the goodwill of the people to the extent they help them in their progress towards democratically based partnership.

The prime need of the colonies is a whole series of Planning Boards. The working out of schemes should be entrusted to public companies, which should be open to the men and capital

1 W. M. Macmillan, *Democracies the Empire*, p. 51, 1941.
See also Morits T. Bonn, *The Crumbling of Empire*, 1938.
Norman Thomas, *Human Exploitation*, 1934.
War, *No Profits, No Glory, No Need*, 1935.
Norman Bentwich, *The Colonial Problem and the Federal Solution*, 1941.

of friendly disposed nations. The Mining Companies should be turned into public utility works and required to plough into the national services a proportion of the return they get from the national wealth in minerals. Social development must be an inevitable complement of enterprise. A wild and unplanned growth of enterprises should be checked. There will be a virgin field for international personnel to work. The educated sections of these regions are demanding opportunities. The democratizing of the imperial authority is the crucial need of the hour.

The *raison d'être* of any New Order is the preservation of justice and civilization. Without a solid basis of harmonious economic relations these values will be torpedoed. Any federal union will stand or fall by the adequacy of its economic structure. The essence of federalism is the taking over of powers whose exercise by the states may be productive of conflict.

The question of migration is a vexed one. The richer areas in a federation might impose restrictions preventing migration into the poorer areas. A readjustment of boundaries remedying this disparity is a possible solution. But alterations of administrative areas every time there occurred important relative shifts in the values of the products of the different constituent states become extremely difficult. According to Professor Lionel Robbins,¹ the right policy seems to be not that no regulation should be allowed, but that what regulation there is should be a federal and not a state function. *Secondly*, the belief that migration from poorer to richer areas must express the actual standard of life of the former, is based on a grossly over-simplified analysis. The chief argument for migration is that it is the only way of removing inequalities arising from position.

A general freeing of the market from high tariff walls is necessary. An absolute prohibition of such restrictions need not be written into the constitution. Nevertheless, only the federal authority would be empowered to impose inter-trade restrictions. Any state law involving discrimination should be rendered inoperative. In the United States, where inter-state trade is completely free, the most formidable body of restrictions has been built up under the shelter of regulations designed to

¹ See Lionel Robbins, *Economic Aspects of Federation*, 1941.

safeguard health and to provide protection against animal and plant diseases.

Ninety-nine per cent talk about "infant" and "invalid" industries is either flat rubbish or paid propaganda. It is the concealed subsidy, not the open, that constitutes a real danger. Therefore, the subsidies should be paid out of special budgets financed exclusively by direct taxation of all incomes.

Unwarranted fluctuations of the exchanges disturb trade. The worst evils of economic nationalism are seen in the field of monetary policy. It should be laid down that the control of money and capital movements within the federation should be a federal function. A single money and unified banking system are desirable. If the federal authority advocates separate systems then it should retain control of the rates of exchange. Says Professor Robbins: "A separate monetary system will be a breeding ground for inter-state disputes. Any economic function which can be discharged without injury to the federating units should be assigned to the constituent states. Public operation of industry, control of local public utilities, social services, research and education will be within the competence of state legislatures. They may nationalise the means of production within their areas or they may impose collectivist controls over private undertakings. But they should not be free to restrict the economic opportunities of the other members of the federation without receiving federal sanction. The power of regulating foreign trade should be vested in the federal government. Therefore, regulation of international trade, international financial relations and immigration must be federal functions.

Nations may rightly wish to exercise some choice in the admission of immigrants but they should not be asked to give up the natural desire for a certain homogeneity of their populations. But the futile idea that a vast country can prosper by preventing immigration and a subsequent growth of its population has definitely to be abandoned. In a system of autarchies, the world will remain very poor. State monopoly of foreign means of payment with subsequent rationing of the supply of exchange will have a destroying influence on the freedom of trade.

No lasting guarantee can be found for the unconditional redeemability of currencies in gold. It is desirable that gold

should continue to serve as an international means of payment, particularly between central banks. To achieve this object a certain stability in the value of gold, i.e., in the purchasing power against commodities must be maintained. A further inflow of the gold into the United States should be checked and it must buy more from abroad than it sells. Wall Street must come to look upon such an under-balance in its foreign trade as favourable which means a complete change in the old mercantile vocabulary.¹

A nation is composed of individuals who have a community of fates. Community of fates signifies a community of needs. If there is community of needs then there must be a community of bread. A community of bread necessarily implies Common Ownership of the land, its treasures and its powers. It denotes the replacement of the old capitalist law by a new and just economic system. This community of interests should transcend national distinctions and sterilize national boundaries. It should set up an impressive machinery of social services and correct the crazily tilted balance as between rich and poor. The desperately needed billions now diverted to the hideous business of war preparation should be utilised for the homes and health of the people. In other words, the notion that rejects a conscious collective planning of economic life, is a notion which ignores the lessons of experience.

The supreme merit of Common Ownership is that it will harness the forces released by science not for destruction of man but for the destruction of poverty. Giant capitalism has enabled a small fraction of the community which owns the biggest blocks of shares in the most important companies to control the means of life. The industrial capacity of the United States is controlled by 1,000 individuals or .0006% capacity of population. To present a case for this soulless machine for creating wealth either morals or in expediency is a hazardous undertaking. The interest of humanity at the present moment is that production be pressed to the maximum possible physical limits. The interest of the biggest shareholder dictates that supply should always fall a little short of demand. This gain-seeking system has failed to use the productive resources and has used them to produce the wrong goods. It has created a wide gulf between production and productive capacity. It will

¹ See Gustav Cassel, *The Downfall of the Gold Standard*, 1936.

take at least 100 years at eight hours a day to produce all the goods required to bring up the standards of the backward peoples to that which is desirable.

Only under a system of Common Ownership the total productive power of the nation can be harnessed to the total needs.¹ If "the profit of the earth is for all" then an economic machinery of Common Ownership must be set up in the supra-national states. The federal cabinet should direct the productive programme. To achieve a world without privilege a unilateral surrender of privileges by those who hold them now is necessary. As a matter of practical expediency compensation should be paid in relation to the needs of the individual. We must recognise that a greater part of small properties is accumulated through hard work while a greater part of the vast properties through anti-social activities. The income-tax returns will serve as a sure basis in awarding compensation.

The Economic General Staff in a supra-national area must conduct a continuous review of its resources. The general plan for the deployment of these resources will be drafted by the federal cabinet. It will be translated into terms of specific orders by the Economic General Staff. It will draw up a programme for the production of goods for immediate consumption and production of permanent assets. It will pass its orders into relevant industries, each of which will be controlled by a council. The members of these councils will be drawn from the industry itself. They will be responsible for all matters of common interest to the industry. The council will tell each factory what it is expected to produce and see that it will work to 100% capacity. The factory policy will be decided as a result of continuous co-operation between managers and technicians. Increased productive capacity will be added to the successful factory. To reduce output the workers will be withdrawn from the least efficient factories.

Within the general frame-work of Common Ownership, private individuals will conduct small independent enterprises. Common Ownership involves conscious and deliberate large-scale decisions. And any large-scale decision must leave gaps and within these gaps there is scope for small-scale enterprise. The banking service will subordinate itself to the state policy. The disequilibrium between expenditure and receipts in foreign

¹ Richard Auctand, *How it will be Like*, 1942.

trade will be corrected by the decisions of the federal parliament.

Relative wage-levels will be determined by the deliberate decision of the community. Reward will be according to the needs and ability of the individual. The main income of the government will be the sale price of all commodities that are produced. The main item of governmental expenditure will be the wages and salaries of all those who work upon common resources.

The Ministry of Man Power will deal with all problems of finding for each man the job he can do and finding for each job the right man. The Industrial Advisory Committee will spread the knowledge of the most successful practices. The federal cabinet assisted by the Committee for Major Developments will evolve the major plans. The technical requirements will be worked out by the Economic General Staff. A Supra-national Research Council will consider the ideas and inventions submitted by citizens. The activities of deliberately organised research must increase to 10,000%. The Supra-national Publicity Council will act as an intermediary between the community in its capacity as producer and the community in its capacity as consumer.

Under Common Ownership, the community will become the land-lord. In England one per cent of all the people own 50% of all the property. Those who now own the farms will become tenants at a peppercorn rent. Those who are tenants now to individuals will become tenants to the community. There is no hope of decent planning except through the Common Ownership of land. All the youth of the country must give one year of service to community. The science of industrial psychology will enable to spot out and register early talent. The cry "I never had a chance" will come from no quarter.

In England and America, a political democracy is working under an economic dictatorship. Common Ownership is the logical outcome of political democracy. For, political democracy and Common Ownership are the twin pillars of a just and stable society.

Out of the furnace of the last war arose Soviet Russia purified from the stains of the most decadent and reactionary tyranny. The great stream of working-class activity which flowed from

that young republic has breached the citadel of political democracy. The Russian actuality has exercised a compelling power over the minds of men. The humanistic idealism of Marx that "all conditions must be revolutionized in which man is a debased, an enslaved, an abandoned, a contemptible being" has been realised. One might disagree with the mental traps of Marxism but his passion for social justice has made him a prophet of revolution. The hope of creating a society in which all men shall live as human beings and shall have human experiences is enshrined in the humanistic ideal of Marx. Stalin has given this ideal a positive content.

The Russians conceived the idea of centralised planning and control, integration in cosmic terms, but in practice limited it to Russia.¹ The Germans conceived it in the more limited but gradually expanding frame-work of *Mittel-Europa*. A New Economic Order must create a society which is genuinely animated by the pursuit of a civilized way of life and in which men by the Common Ownership of property fulfil themselves in work.

1 "I see in Stalin's leadership today the able and certainly grandiose liquidation of a utopian doctrinalism, while securing what I have described as one of the main objectives of our own efforts in Germany, the preservation of *continuity of development*. Stalin has not permitted a further revolutionary or counter-revolutionary breach to come. It seems to me that this is a great achievement in statesmanship."

Hermann Rausching, *Make and Break with the Nazis*, p. 227, 1942.

8

A NEW SOCIAL ORDER

THE IDEAL of democrats all over the world now is to transform the bourgeois democracy into social democracy. But few of them have the imagination to perceive that the inevitable complement of political democracy would be the demand for social equality. Equality of voting rights does not seem real democracy. Real democracy is not and can never be consistent with any large degree of social inequality.

A socialist state can never be reached through the ballot-box. And the integration of all social elements, classes, groups and individuals in a real community is possible only under socialism. Harcourt's remark "We are all socialists nowadays" is acquiring an international flavour. Some people have tasted it through reformism and others through revolution and dictatorship. The forces released by this war have made democracy conscious of collectivity and its rights.

Professor Laski applauds the reality of British democracy and its rights that it has been preserved even in war-time, but feels the need to carry it even farther, smashing down all the remaining bastions of artificial privilege. Mr. Cole thinks that the acquisitive basis of the British society is a hindrance to maximise the war effort.¹ Private ownership and control of industry restricts production. The classless equality of sacrifice obtaining in the face of immediate danger, whether on the battle-field or on the sinking ship, obtains so much less completely on the social and economic home-front.

The pitiless one-ideal man, who governs the people by hewing his way to power scorns social equality. He means by freedom only a strong kind of chain. This view is worked out in a brilliant form by Professor Joad; according to him, "The Nazi regime is the eclipse of the mind, the death of the spirit, the Dark Night of the soul, the greatest single set-back for humanity

¹ *Victory or Vested Interest?* G. D. H. Cole, etc., 1942.

that history records." And further, a Nazi victory would usher in "a New Dark Age, an age in which the mind of man would go into prison and the spirit of man into retreat." Thus he deduces from the plenitude of this representation the conclusion "If civilization survived at all, it would survive in holes and corners in daily peril of its existence." Then we can substitute the other image, the image of the harmonious concord of the spiritual and corporal life, which pervade each other in the whole and in every part of the *corpus mysticum* made one in the Spirit of God.

H. G. Wells regards that this is a war to arrest and reverse the collapse of the human society. He expressly describes his idea of the three-fold basis of the New Order. Its basis must be a federal air-control, a sweeping conservation of world's resources and the establishment of a fundamental world law. Then only a fair, free, decent living would be possible on earth. According to Wells the ultimate revolution is the salvaging of the human society. Its primary task is one of identical propaganda in which "Communism will be liquidated, reanimated and recast." He construes the worst part of Marx's heritage as "the Dictatorship of the Proletariat." He inveighs against this doctrine when he remarks "Nobody knows really what and where this proletariat is, still less do they know how and where it dictates."

Trotsky says expressly that Lenin's idea of the party was the replacement of the dictatorship of the proletariat by a dictatorship over the proletariat. The apparatus of the party substituted itself for the party, the central committee substituted itself for the apparatus and finally the dictator substituted himself for the central committee. If Lenin assumed that proletarian dictatorship must be abandoned for the dictatorship of the party, Trotsky insisted that party dictatorship must be abandoned for the dictatorship of the centre. Trotsky was criticised as more reckless than revolutionary when he set forth the proposition that to accomplish the overturn of the vested interests, the proletariat needs all its strength, passion and ruthlessness. And it must be free from the fictions of religion, democracy and transcendental morality—the spiritual chains forged by the enemy to tame and enslave it. With all the warmth of his factual polemics Trotsky argued that only that which prepared the complete and final overthrow of imperialist bestiality was moral, and nothing else. He deduced with inexorable vigour, the principle that the supreme law is the welfare of the revolution.

It lies beyond the scope of our monograph to refute all the misconceptions and perversions of the socialist ideology. The Russian experiment even in its present phase contains the germ, later to grow luxuriantly, of a purely socialistic, and federal construction of the people. Therefore, we feel it necessary to touch upon the essentials of the doctrine and attempt to bring out its full inwardness. It is but seldom that there has emerged new viewpoints, sharper formulations and far-reaching conclusions of the Marxian theory. We may say expressly that Capitalism has become fatally enmeshed in a network of contradictions and it is now on its death-bed. Karl Marx was the first to foresee this stage when he analysed the laws of economic phenomena in his *Das Kapital*. Marx made a scientific approach to the problem of Capitalism and after analysing it he expressed the opinion that it is doomed to failure. As a politician he sought means of accelerating that inevitable process and of rendering its fulfilment less painful. His action and doctrine have been baptized Marxism.¹

The anti-Marxists argue² that the religion of collective will is incompatible with the true enjoyment of the values of life. Whether socialism signifies individualism generalised and made accessible to everyone or whether it means a total surrender to some authoritative concept of the collective good must be clarified. The essential meaning of the Revolution was the liberation of individuality. To reduce freedom to efficiency or to a spoken ritual will make socialism hardly distinguishable from the Nazi rule. In other words, it is criminal gang-rule as the chief-end of man. Stalin, therefore, preaches a super-civilization and presents his tyranny as a beginning of it.

In this structure, the "moral person" is nothing more than a "robot." It is said by the opponents of Stalinism that in Russia exploitation through the wage-system survives and the state which owns the industries is controlled by a single monolithic party. Therefore, the industries are not really nationalised much less collectivised. The change brought about is neither social nor economic but merely legal. The party bosses who control the income from the state run industries form the axis of a new

¹ See Morris Hillquit, *From Marx to Lenin* p. 6, 1921; Sidney Hook, *Towards the Understanding of Karl Marx*, 9, 81; Marx set forth his theory of history most effectively in the following works *Die deutsche Ideologie*, written in 1846 and published posthumously in *Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels historisch-Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, e. by D. Ryazanoff ii Vols. (1927-81) Vol. I, pp. 7-87, 211-219; *Poverty of Philosophy*; *Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*; *Capital*;

² See Max Eastman, *Marxism, Is it Science?* 1941; H. B. Parkes, *Marxism; A. Post-Mortem*, 1940; F. J. C. Hearnshaw, *A Survey of Socialism*, 1928.

bureaucracy. If socialism means a society of the free and equal, then Russia presents an ideological delusion. In the natural course a collectivised society must lead to a totalitarian state. Max Eastman adds a real element of frightfulness to the charge-sheet framed by the critics of anti-bureaucracy when he says "The world is finding out that the Stalin-Hitler-Pact is no temporary manoeuvre but a vital union of two profoundly similar regimes.¹ When national socialism clasped its hands with socialism over the grave of Polish independence, the word socialism became a liability to any genuine movement of liberation.

In a most elaborate and vigorous fashion, the Anti-Marxists argue that socialism is not the content of our moral life but an effort to solve a specific problem. Such a conception necessitates the rejection of the Marxian legend of universal upward evolution or the ridding of the socialist theory of this element of philosophical belief. Marx turned only the other-side-up of Hegel's philosophy. To win a social struggle we should never bandage our eyes like blind stud-bulls. Therefore, the revision of the socialist ideal in the light of science is a paramount need.

It is suggested that a scheme of distribution for an economy of abundance not involving totalitarianism should be evolved. The collective-co-operation principle should be adjusted to the liberty-individuality principle. Max Lerner's conception of democratic collectivism envisages a society in which private property and private industrial initiative would remain but the capitalists could make their decisions on a policy only within a framework set-up by planning boards. He maintains that a democratic capitalist society can plan effectively if capitalism is taken away from capitalists and make its basic decisions socially national and responsible.

It should be noted that the attack on Stalinism is most sharply and mistakenly made by Max Eastman. The bond as well as the basis of the socialist civilization is democratic culture and eternal values. The most acceptable and modern definition of socialism is that it is a combination of the technical revolution in the rights of property with the fullest extension of the individual and worker's freedom. In this definite sense the Soviet Union is a multi-national state based on a set of common socialist institutions. It is a close federation of eleven Soviet Republics, pyra-

¹ Max Eastman, *Stalin's Russia and the Crisis in Socialism*, 1940.

midical in shape, based on a net-wok of soviets and built up by delegation from below. The Stalin Constitution of 1936 is the legislative consolidation of the triumphs of socialism. It is the expression of the political maturity of the multi-national Soviet people.

The franchise is universal, open to all of either sex, eighteen years of age. No restrictions, as regards property qualification, standard of education, domicile, sex, nationality or race are imposed. The constitution provides for recall. On the eve of the elections study circles and lectures were organised in factories, farms and mills. On December 12, 1937, 19,113,153 people or 96.8 per cent. of the voters went to the polls.

After the October Revolution, the covert agents of the defeated classes persisted in their subversive activities. Franchise restrictions were put on these handful of exploiters as a necessary measure of precaution. It is absurd to suppose that socialism ever envisaged the imposition of restrictions. What it did actually set up as a doctrine is that men shall not be allowed to exploit their fellow-men, and this is precisely what distinguishes it from capitalism. It should be remembered that in the Czarist Russia the great masses were the disenfranchised dumb tools. Now they are drawn into the activities of the Soviets. Therefore, the power of the Soviet democracy rests on the ever-growing activity of its people. It not only proclaims the right of the citizens but has made legislative guarantees for the proper exercise of those rights. Equality of all citizens is enshrined in Article 123: "Any direct or indirect restriction of the rights of, or, conversely, any establishment of direct or indirect, as well as any advocacy of racial or national exclusiveness or hatred or contempt, is punishable by law."

In democratic countries the government has far less power and the Big Business has far more. Parliamentary democracy can act only through representatives, and these representatives can act only through parties and the parties are working within an undemocratic social framework. The great historic parties have not been built up from below, on a basis of mass membership, and have not derived their policies from the express will of their members. In a realistic spirit Stalin observes: "It is difficult for me to imagine what personal liberty is enjoyed by an unemployed person, who goes about hungry, and cannot find employment. Real liberty can exist only where there is no oppression

of some by other, where there is no unemployment and poverty, where a man is not haunted by the fear of being tomorrow deprived of work, of home and of bread. Only in such a society is real, and not paper, personal and every other liberty is possible." These idyllic conditions exist only in Russia, where the broadest democracy prevails.

Russia presents in terms of class-structure an inspiring ideal.¹ The entire Soviet economy is based on public interest. The Constitution provides: "The right to work is ensured by the socialist organisation of the national economy, the steady growth of the productive forces of the Soviet society, the elimination of the possibility of economic crisis, and the abolition of unemployment." Stalin's Russia has pressed forward irresistibly towards this declared aim. The profit-motive and the motive of class-exploitation are eradicated. The use of the national resources is deliberately planned, on a basis of public service. To the imperialistic publicists the Russian actuality is a morbid derangement. The criticism of Wells suffers from far-fetched conceits when he remarks "Russia is in an autocratic state socialism, and the idea of modern democracy, entirely foreign and perplexing to the eastern mind, has been wrapped up and thrust aside in that fantastic self-contradictory phrase 'the Dictatorship of the Proletariat'—which still Stalin is trying to explain to himself and to us." The attack of Wells is indeed of slight importance when he says "Communism comes back to this Atlantic world as alien as Baha'ism or Yoga or Bushido, as little capable of taking root. Falsification, mischief-making, sabotage and counter-murder are the substance of its imaginations."

To those who think of facts and not of phrases the tone and substance of Wells' accusations look unedifying. His diagnosis of the Communist party and its ideological basis is mischievous. As stated in the Constitution "the directive principle of the organisational structure of the party is democratic centralisation." The voluntary centralism of the party no doubt focuses power in a very small group. But before the meeting of the Congress there will be a thorough debate leading down to every cell in the factory or farm. The Cause, the Revolution is of deeper concern than the individual. Stalin is the chief of the paid party workers spread over the country. He must always

¹ See W. P. Coates and Zelda K. Coates, *From Czarism to Stalin Constitution*; Boris Britakus: *Economic Planning in Soviet Russia*; *Democracy in Practice*; (U. S. S. R. speaks for itself Series) 1941, Franz Borkenau, *Socialism, National or International?* 1942.

have a solid majority of the Party behind him. Herein lies his power and the surest guarantee that he will not misuse that power.

The Communist Party has the best brains, the experience and the political power to implement its programme. The following table conclusively proves that the Soviet system is not democracy in the abstract, but socialist democracy. The net-work of Soviets is the machinery for eliciting the greatest possible total of active attention to political affairs. In this sense, Russia, under dictatorship, is the most democratically organised community in the world,¹

Election to		Number and percentage of votes for the Communist and Non-Party Block	
1. Soviet of the Union	...	89,844,271	98.6%
2. Soviet of the Nationalities	...	89,063,169	97.8%
3. Supreme Soviet of the Union and the Autono- mous Republics	92,461,146	99.4%

In a society based on co-operation, on production for use and not for profit, there is naturally no room for the exploitation of one class by another. Russia has applied the principle of equal opportunity and freedom for all peoples to use their own language and to develop their own national culture over one-sixth of the world's surface, comprising 200 different nationalities. If socialism becomes the basis of post-war reconstruction, the same could be applied to the rest of the world, if capitalist exploitation of class by class and nation by nation were eliminated.

Tsarist Russia was a prison of nations. The ignorant peoples of the North were the victims of the sharp practices of traders who would exchange a sewing needle for a deer skin and a couple of blue fox skins for an axe. The resistance of the prostrate people was broken by sowing the Dragon's teeth of discord.

The Cossack and Jew, Ukrainian and Great Russian, Pole and Armenian lived in perpetual strife. Jew-baiting was the favourite pastime of the Black Hundreds. Instruction in the native language was forbidden.

¹ See U.S.S.R.: *Its Significance for the West* (The Socialist clarity Group Publication,) 1942.

The Great October Revolution wiped out national privileges and restrictions. With the disappearance of political inequality and exploitation national enmity also vanished. Everyone of the Republics felt the pulse of change and development. To ward off danger from foreign interventionists and internal counter-revolutionary forces a common front of all the Soviet Republics was organised. The national policy has opened the spring-wells of national culture and arts. The constituent republics enjoy equal rights and have hammered out their constitution in conformity with the constitution of the U.S.S.R. It is significant that the right of secession is conceded to the federated units.

The constitution of the U.S.S.R. is bi-cameral, the Soviet of Union and the Soviet of Nationalities enjoying equal rights. Each Union Republic irrespective of the size elects 25 deputies to the Soviet of Nationalities. Each autonomous republic elects 10 deputies, each autonomous region five and each national area one deputy. The underlying spirit of unity is expressed in an old Russian saying "The bonfire will burn brighter if all the twigs are put together."

In all capitalist countries, there have been prolonged controversies and bitter struggle over the status to be given to women. Women in the U.S.S.R. enjoy equal rights with men in all spheres of state activity. The principle of equal pay for equal work, whether performed by men or women is strictly observed. In 1937, the number of women gainfully employed was 9,000,000. In 1936, 39 per cent. of all the women employed were working in large-scale industries, 15 per cent in shops, stores, transport and public catering establishments, 20 per cent. as doctors and teachers, 2 per cent. domestic workers and the remaining 24 per cent. in various branches of industry, science or the arts. The mother can leave the child at Kindergarten or nursery while she is at work. These institutions accommodated 1,800,000 children in 1937. The Third Five Year Plan provides for the care of 4,200,000 children. Public dining-rooms, ready-to-serve and ready-to-cook food relieves her of a great share of domestic work. She receives an annual vacation with pay and if her health requires it she gets a free vacation in a rest house. 19,000,000 women are now employed in the collective and state farm fields. If the collective farmer turns out more than the allotted quota in the working day, he is credited correspondingly larger number of work-day units.

In the U.S.S.R. marriage is a voluntary union of free and equal persons. In the eye of the Soviet law registered and unregistered marriages are equally valid. A marriage may be dissolved either by mutual agreement or at the desire of either one of them. In registering the divorce the state establishes how much each of the parties must contribute to the support of children and with whom they should live. Upon the birth of the seventh child, the mother receives the benefit of 2,000 rubles annually until the child is five years of age. In 1936, the law prohibiting abortions went into effect. The result was a sharp fall in the number of divorces. In Moscow in 1936, there were 16,182 divorces whereas in 1937 it fell to 8,961. Of the 601,000 college and university students 43 per cent. are women. 500,000 women have passed athletic tests and there are 12,500 women scientific workers. Once Chernyshevsky observed "With what a true, powerful and penetrating mind Nature has endowed women! And this mind remains of no use to society, which spurns it, crushes it, smothers it, although the history of mankind would progress ten times as rapidly if the mind were not spurned and killed, but were exercised." The history of Soviet Russia is the history of women emancipated.

Nurseries, Kindergartens and Children's Clubs have become a basic element of Soviet life. More than ten million children are receiving technical and cultural education. Elementary education is universal and under the Third Five Year Plan, high school education will be made universal in the towns. In 1939 the summer camps accommodated 1,400,000 children. They have sailed on the Black Sea and the Volga and have covered thousands of kilometers by rail and on foot. They have stored their minds with a knowledge of people, their work and psychology. Children's clubs are developing themselves into art institutions for juveniles. Soviet children are strangers to fawning but they are intelligently disciplined. They study, develop and prepare for their future freely and fully. Soviet boys and girls have as many ways open to them as there are trades and professions. Former homeless waifs are now factory managers.

In the last two decades primary schools have increased by 19,000%. Many nationalities have been helped to evolve a national language for the first time. Vocational training schools are attached directly to the factories. They are equipped with workshops, classrooms and experimental laboratories. These schools have provided 2,000,000 skilled operatives. Personal

effort determines one's position in the Soviet society. Young men and women under 30 years of age comprise 10.4% of the directors of various factories and plants of 10.5% of the total number of chief engineers and 20.1% of departmental managers. Among the members of the Supreme Soviet there are 284 young men and women under 30 years of age. Over 10,000,000 are members of various athletic clubs. Soviet sportsmen have at their disposal 650 stadiums, 7,200 athletic fields, 2,713 gymnasiums and 2,700 skiing stations. During the years of Soviet rule 40,000,000 adults have become literate. In the present phase of social stress and emergency the Soviet youth is displaying deathless heroism. It has the vigour, the efficiency and the dynamic integrity to become a true instrument of Russian victory. Its will and wisdom is mirrored in the song :

To the youth now every door is open,
 Everywhere the old with honour go;
 But if any foe should try to smash us,
 Try to desolate our land so dear,
 Like thunder, like the sudden lightning,
 We shall give our answer, sharp and clear.

In the U.S.S.R. a correct relationship is established between the individual and the community. His freedom as a person and his responsibilities to society are clearly defined. The schemes for helping the old or the disabled are the expression and extension of the above policy. Every man who has reached the age of 60 and has worked for not less than 25 years, and every woman who has reached the age of 55 and has worked for not less than 20 years, receives a pension, irrespective of his or her capacity for work. On reaching old age people engaged in underground work are pensioned at 60% of their last earnings, operatives employed in heavy industries receive 55% and those in light industries 50%. Palatial mansions are put at the disposal of old pensioners. The government has established a system of co-operative enterprise under which aged or partially disabled persons can engage themselves in profitable work.

The entire medical staff is in the employ of the State. It provides them with the working conditions most suitable for their activities. The latest achievements of medical science and technique are placed at their disposal. In 1913 there were 19,785 physicians and now 132,000. In 1937 10,300,000,000 rubles were spent on public health, a sum 75 times more than what was spent

in Tsarist Russia. The reconstruction of industry and agriculture is made in full accordance with scientific requirements of industrial hygiene and sanitation. Slums have been wiped out. A great increase is made in the availability of nutritious food. In 1933 the annual average wage of a worker in industry was 1531 rubles and 3,447 in 1938. There is no prostitution as the economic causes for it are removed. It is noteworthy that there was no single case of syphilis among the young men called up to service in the Red Army. In Russia prostitution is regarded "a bourgeois vice."

There is a very intimate connection between crime and the political and economic conditions of a country. Man's poverty, endemic unemployment, corruption, speculative frenzy are the hotbeds that lead to crime. The root of juvenile crime lies deeply embedded in the social base of the modern capitalist state. The October Revolution effected a radical change in social relations. The Law of August 7, 1932 safeguarding—socialist property is a keystone in the system of revolutionary legislation. The growth of socialist reconstruction has led to a constant drop in crime. From 1935-37 there was a fall of 28% in the total crime.

A cardinal change has occurred in Russia as a result of the historic victory of socialism. About 1,000 offenders voluntarily came to confess their guilt. Socialism which establishes a new culture, re-educates people, changes their psychology, induces them to adopt a new attitude to the world, that envelopes them, to other groups, to society.

The "anti-bureaucratic" critics complain that a new class of officials and technicians has sprung in Russia, and it is lord-ing over the common people.¹ The answer to this is that while Soviet society is not fully equalitarian, it approximates fairly well to the declared aim of the Revolution. No planned society can function without a stratum of experts, who can guarantee the continuity of economic life by accepting final responsibility and exercising the power of control. It is a mistaken inference to say that a planned society and the existence of a technocracy will lead to a dictatorship.²

The year 1934 witnessed the spectacle of Russia swinging to the Right in the practice of her radical philosophy. Differentia-

1 James Burnham, *The Managerial Revolution*, 1942.

2 See G. A. Soule, *A Planned Society*, 1932; G. D. H. Cole, *Economic Planning* 1936, Mary Van Kleeck, *On Economic Planning*, 1935.

tion of wages was introduced as an incentive for raising the productivity. The Stakhanov movement is the application of science to labour. Nearly 2 million out of 17 million workers are directly benefited from this development. The worker by putting more effort can get into the higher wage category. Only 20% of the whole bureaucracy earns considerably more than the average worker. The factory managers get the highest salaries but the material privilege is confined to the sphere of consumption. This new technocracy is not a closed, self-perpetuating social group to acquire the characteristics of a class. It is a functional body.

In the sphere of development Russia has made astonishing progress. Since 1913 there has been a ten-fold increase in her heavy industrial production. While in the same period German production has advanced by 500%. Russia during this period was ravaged by a civil war and two periods of famine. As early as 1937, 80% of all industrial products and 90% of all agricultural machines came from factories which had been newly built.

It is true that the standard of living in Russia is lower than the standards which prevail in countries of Western Europe and North America. Russia based no great hopes on foreign credits and had to save enormous sums from current income. It is here the miracle of planning showed itself. The plan was worked out on the basis not of natural but of a money economy. *Secondly*, she had to direct her productive resources to the building of adequate military strength. The phenomenal progress of Russia since two decades is indicated in the following table ;

GROWTH OF THE U. S. S. R.

	(1918)	(1940)
Population	189	193 million
Workers and Employees	11.2	30.4 m.
National Income	21	125 million rubles
Budget Expenditure	6,670 (1925)	172, 259 m. r.
Hospitals (beds)	175	840 thousand
Institution for Care of Women and Children	9	4354 (1937)
Education :		
(attendance at Primary and Secondary Schools) ...	7.8	35 m.
Higher Education	112	620 thousand
Books	86	701 m.
Threatres	153	825
Electric Power	1.9	39.6 K. M. (1938)
Coal	29	164.6 m. tons.
Oil and Gas	9.2	34.2 m. tons.
Steel	42	184 m. tons.
Tractors	nil	523 thousand
Grain	801	1,195 m. centners.
Raw Cotton	7.4	25.2 m. centners.

Note : The basic sources are *U. S. S. R. Statistics* (Moscow) *American Review on the Soviet Union*, (June, 1941), published in New York by the American Russian Institute ; the *Report* made by N. Voznesensky to the 18th All-Union Congress of the C.P.S.U. February, 1941

The Russian system has undergone the supreme test and proved its resiliency while all the Western European countries collapsed at the Nazi touch. The cause of the French collapse was that the boundaries of democracy were limited by the claims of traditional privileges. That society is only stable in which the relation of the forms of production is adjusted to the ownership of its instruments. Rosa Luxemburg said that the struggle for reforms was the means and the social revolution the aim. This gave rise to the distinction between immediate demands and ultimate programme. Professor Laski urges that now only the beginnings of a fundamental change should be initiated, and that the process should be spread over long years of peace.

If we admit that the trend of history points to progress from social violence to social contract, then the change in the social scene must be brought about by peaceful means. There is an element of truth in the charge that individualism has degenerated into egoism. This has made democracy "run to fat." Democracy in order to survive as a doctrine must give to each individual, as in the U.S.S.R., a secure prospect of food, health, habitation, maintenance and opportunity. It must guarantee the Right to Work and the Right to Leisure after work. Democracy is now a social principle and it must be endowed with a powerful emotional content, representing a fusion of materialism and spirituality.

Today democracy is not an assured possession and it is still a problem. In the fascist tendencies there is a glow of false dawn. Totalitarianism exhibits robust practical advantages over democracy. It should answer the strategy with a rediscovery of itself. It will be morally unequal to its task unless it bases the inner structure of the state and the community of states on socialism. Thus Russia constitutes a reinforcement of democracy.

This structural reform should not preserve an inhuman social order but must replace it with a more humane order, which will create a true hierarchy of values. As Le Cour Grand-Maison, a deputy in the French Chamber said, money should be put in the service of production, production in the service of humanity and humanity itself in the service of an ideal which gives meaning to life.

To recapture the initiative in world affairs from the totalitarian powers, democracy should alter the pattern of its society. The international outlook must be an extension and reflection of this

domestic policy. There are direct and indirect influences that shape the long-term outlook and ideas of persons. The instruments of direct influence are the educational system, organised religion and the press. Especially in war-time the influence of the radio on the people in forming judgment on immediate events is considerable.

The value of the democratic tradition is that it provides a basis of social reconstruction by non-violent means. Its purpose is debauched if it is used to create a screen behind which inequality and privilege can flourish. The British educational system perpetuates social differences. It is not one system, but two, a state system of public education and a private system of public education. It is a just complaint that in England, "Gentlemen" with political ambition ever aspire for the Presidency of the Board of Education and the second-rate politicians chosen lack capacity and sense. The middle-class apes this contempt for state education without being able to bear the costs of a public school, run frequently by ladies of nice manners. Its purpose is to segregate children of the better-off from the masses and instil into them a snobbish religion of the class. Conditions of over-crowding, shocking equipment and poor teaching are tolerated in the state schools.

If the social purpose of education in all civilised communities is to build up a secure tradition of reasonableness, the British system is out-moded. The children should be trained beyond the confines of a particular calling as members of the international community. The public school system has the most forceful impact upon social policies because the future oligarchs have passed through it. But democracy requires fluidity in its social structure. And the oligarchs will have acquired a social morality opposed to change. Any alteration in the existing social values affects them. Therefore, the school insists on loyalty and discipline and keenly denies individual judgment. Such a system is hardly likely to shape a highly intelligent and open-minded public opinion susceptible to the need for radical change in the shape of the society.

In England on the fourteenth birthday, the mental education of children attending state school ceases. At the age of sixteen 90% of them are little wage-earners. In the democratic civilization they are denied the benefits of higher education. It is obvious that the British educational system badly needs amend-

ment and overhaul. Education is the most basic of all instruments of propaganda. The caste-system in education should be broken down.

The Church of England occupies a key position in the education of the country. It has strong social links with the public school. It very directly controls 9,068 out of the 20,905 state elementary schools in Britain. Religious education is given every day. It is not easy to shake off moral conventions deeply implanted in childhood. Respectability means absence of opposition to the standards which the Church upholds. Social ethics do not come within the pale of its religious experience and it speaks as of right in such matters. No doubt its insistence on moral value as opposed to material expediency has developed a social conscience in Britain. But its powerful influence is not thrown on the side of social and international change. The Church has become absorbed in the oligarchy of power and social rigidity. It has closed its eyes to inequalities and it has nothing new to say for men struggling for security. So long as the Church dignitaries assert their moral principles over economic appetites, they have an important place in the human scheme. The moral principles of civilization are now challenged by the philosophy of uncontrolled profit-making. We want a voice to remind men that they have souls as well appetites. The Church should become without compromise that voice of the soul of men.

The press had laid aside its bugle for the Jazz drum. The newspaper industry exists to make profits. Moral conviction is subordinated to the overriding requirements of profitable production. The newspaper proprietor aims at the greatest common denominator of public opinion. The quickest and the easiest way to large circulation is through a bright and superficial surface treatment of serious news which deliberately places no great strain upon the concentration or the intelligence of the reader. With this must be combined a great deal of sporting news, a woman's page with escapist appeal, pictures of glamour girls, and a typographical display by adroit design. The lower paid class who form 73% of the population of Britain want a paper which provides the tonic of optimism. It should never betray a sustained interest in serious argument. It must decoy them to its point of view by its display and choice of news.

This attitude constitutes a live threat to democracy. No intelligent day by day analysis of world events is given. They

give little guide to the deeper reasons behind the facts. Seldom we find informed comment. Action news is preferred to background news. This develops insulatory outlook. The small circulation paper seeks the support of the well-off. The popular paper rarely allows itself the luxury of seriousness. That is why, people have ceased to regard newspapers as reliable purveyors of war news and have come to rely on broadcast news. Most of the journals have failed to adapt themselves to the changed standards of news value brought by war.

A free press is the guardian of essential rights, the critic of defeatism and the vehicle of opinion. The censorship of the press and the prevention of the badly needed comment had a substantial part in the moral decay of France which preceded its collapse.

It is increasingly becoming obvious that a sense of common world citizenship should prevail over patriotism. Then only the effort to build up an international order based upon international public opinion will become a reality. If a genuine international opinion had existed, the Roman Catholic Church would not have blessed the Abyssinian adventure and *The Times* would not have emphasised that it was better for Mussolini to have his way than to oppose him. The Gadarene foreign policy of Britain and the degeneration of the English domestic scene could have been avoided if there were a healthy public opinion. Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, Rumania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia alike thought in terms of national interests and were subjugated individually. The period between 1929 and 1939 probably witnessed more inter-state undertakings broken than any previous decade in modern history. In truth, the three Powers of the Triangle mocked at international morality.

The peacemakers of 1914 thought that reason was the ultimate arbiter in human affairs. They did not visualise the uprush of emotionalism which gave birth to fascism. They did not contemplate that people would lightly abandon the democratic forms of government. Finally, they underrated the emotional attachment of the individual to the state.

The future international authority must have far more power at its disposal than the League of Nations, and it must enjoy the direct loyalty of all individuals. With equal decisiveness we may assert that the achievement of the international opinion must not remain simply an aspiration. The behaviour of the

individual citizen in the international sphere should conform itself to the standards he has accepted in the particular state. The change, however, depends on the resolution of the individual himself. By his well-considered reasoning Professor J. C. Flugel says we are in fact only beginning to develop the first rudiments of ethical thinking as applied to politics. World unity will remain a will-o'-the-wisp so long as the emphasis is upon the differences that separate the nations and not the similarities that bind them.

From several viewpoints indeed it is necessary that combativeness and the assertion of the human ego must be rendered less socially disruptive in their incidence. There should be informed discussion on the means to achieve an international order based on harmony and social justice.

In the smaller democracies education has brought about spiritual revival among the farmers. The Danish educational prophet Grundtvig formed the famous Danish Folk High schools which spread practical culture. The unprogressive, sullen, averse to experiment peasant was transformed into heartily co-operative, mobile and scientifically-minded citizen. Especially in America the chain of Institutes of International Affairs has begun to exercise an important influence upon American public opinion. Professor Keeton holds the view that after the war Europe will have to be re-educated and the German nation should not be allowed to run amok a third time. He says expressly that the German people should be trained for world citizenship.

The idea to begin an educational offensive now is most fully supported by Professor Keeton.¹ He is optimistic that at the present moment England has the materials from which a vital educational organisation can be built. In that island there has already sprung up an International Air Force and an International Navy. The world needs a permanent brotherhood of scholars, which will form a strong bulwark for the new international order.

The principal aim of such a University should be the organisation of educational activities to promote the idea of world unity. Its ultimate aim should include social and political problems and it should expound civilized values. He recommends

¹ G. W. Keeton, *The Case for an International University*, 1941.

the British Council as a model. This curious organisation is the creation of Lord Lloyd and it sends well-dressed women and other personages abroad to charm and win over foreign appreciation for British political virtues and British way of life. Mr. H. G. Wells criticising the production of this disingenious muck for foreign consumption regards any governmental propaganda as contrary to the essential spirit of democracy.

The World University should serve as a forum where all proposals for world peace and unity should be examined. It should organise research into all those forms which arise in the realisation of a world order. Committees and individual specialists should publish the results of their investigations. Its organisation should be federal in character, with centres in all the chief cities of those nations which adopt the scheme. This University will teach not a hybrid internationalism, but an ordered nationalism, seeking to establish the place of individual national cultures within the general pattern. Today the follies of academic neutrality are very glaring. The University should teach the lesson of history, that wars will survive so long as national interests override the common good.

The deeply cherished plan of Mr. H. G. Wells is the organised World Brain of an awakened and co-operative mankind.¹ The scientific world should be "better-equipped, amply co-ordinated, free to question, able to demand opportunity." The development of man's power over Nature and over this still unexplored planet should undergo a continual acceleration. Then the New World Order can open a wider life to mankind.

Professor McDougall remarks that the world is in a state to promote the laughter of Gods.² His diagnosis of the world chaos is that the physical sciences, while conferring many benefits have produced a complexity of our civilization which far outruns our present understanding and power of control. Systematic research in the science of man and society can avert the ultimate and rapid decline of western civilization. The biological science indicates regions in which chaos still reigns, yet regions which must be reduced to order if civilization is to endure. Such weighty utterances as that of Professor McDougall are not isolated.

¹ H. G. Wells, *Guide to the New World: A Handbook of Constructive World Revolution*, pp. 143-148, 1941.

² William McDougall, *World Chaos*, 1941; He says "The great condition of the decline of any civilization is the inadequacy of the quality of the people who are the bearers of it." (*National Welfare and National Decay*) (p. 86).

In particular, physical science fills the public mind by its description of atoms magnified to the size of cathedrals. Quite overlooked by many is the fact that the mechanistic scheme of explanation crumbles down within the sphere of inorganic phenomena. Dr. J. S. Haldane in his polemical writings concerning the quarrel about the superiority of physical or social sciences emphatically denies the claim of the physical science to represent objective reality. It is estimated that in the United States alone research in the physical sciences is subsidised by industry to the extent of five hundred million dollars a year, a sum evidently greater than the combined income of all British Universities. If some physicist harnesses the energy unlocked within the atom he can bring about sudden destruction. Therefore, every step of progress that physical science makes adds to our dangers, for it increases the lopsidedness of our civilization.

Says McDougall 'Whatever else this much-discussed force nationalism may be, it is in some sense a component of a multitude of energies that reside and operate in the breasts of human individuals; and its working cannot be understood until we have at our command some well-founded psychology, both individual and collective. If we had not grossly neglected the studies of anthropology and psychology we might have avoided the present difficulties in India and China; and our Indian Empire might not have been lost.' He has sought to prove at length that the Universities should shelter and develop thinkers who will expore the phenomena of social life. We need a new scale of values in which such prestige shall attach to social sciences as hitherto physical science alone has enjoyed.

Allied to this problem of education is that of sterilising colour and race prejudice throughout the world. This vicious discrimination is a product of the Western European governments. The clash and struggle for supremacy is but a struggle for survival. The rhetoric of purblind idealists proclaiming the brotherhood of man cannot hide the harsh realities of a concrete world of inequalities. In the six continents of the globe there is a long recital of war, race-riot, revolution, civil commotion and massacre, more continuous and on a vaster scale than at any time in recorded history.

Experts are almost all agreed that competition between species and the selective agency of varied environmental conditions have led to the survival of the better adapted or better equipped

species and to the extermination of others. While those changes have enabled the mamalia to drive out the large reptalia which preceeded them and man to exterminate large number of mamalia and the bird species, it is recognised that further changes in living conditions, may lead to the eventual extinction of the whole human species by insects or by increasingly formidable bacteria and other parasitic micro-organisms.

Biological changes render continuity of racial identity an illusion. According to Pitt-Rivers¹ human history in its totality is a tripartite record which should refer to (1) the history of populations—considered according to their regional organisations, inter-related to (2) the history of races considered in relation to changes in, and migrations of, stocks, which again, is related to (3) the history of culture and its evolution. Between these three aspects of human history there is the closest interaction but no consecutive correspondence. Therefore, culture is the fruit and expression of man's mental activity, accumulated and transmitted through the generations.

The general culture-level of a people at a particular time is conditioned by three factors : by their heritage of culture-forms, together with culture-accessories and by their culture-potential. For most anthropologists 'race' implies a biological group based on the common possession of an indefinite number of physical characteristics. In this specific sense, human history is the outcrop of human behaviour. As to the evolution of culture-forms, Pitt-Rivers argues precisely that it must be "correlated to the history and evolution of race, for only in this way—by tracing the history of culture-potential, in the mixing, blending and substitution of racial stocks—can we hope to explain the rise and fall of civilizations, the degradation no less than the development of culture."

No one, however, refers more forcibly the idea that race should refer primarily to ethnic identity and distinction and should not involve the difficult and uncertain question of ethnic origin than Pitt-Rivers. By the selective agency of ethnic clashes and of changed climatic conditions a "new strain" may in the course of time evolve or become specialised. The term "race" implies identity or measurable distinction and a constant degree of relative homogeneity. A race is said to have become extinct with

¹ See George Henry Lane-Fox Pitt-Rivers, *The Clash of Culture and the Contact of Races*, 1927 A. C. Goldenweiser, *Early Civilization*; H. J. Fluere, *The Races of Mankind*, 1927.

the disappearance of its last surviving representatives of the unadulterated stock. A race survives only in so far as it is ethnically segregated.

Today races are in all stages of differentiation, hence has arisen clash of opinion among anthropologists as to the number of existing human races. Huxley at first counted 11, and subsequently reduced the number to 4. In 1859 Denikar divided mankind into 13 main races with 30 sub-races. Finally he deemed it necessary to recognise 12 races and 29 sub-races. We have to altogether reject the idea of racial purity as interbreeding has taken place and is now occurring along racial frontiers. Sir Arthur Keith expressly says that any attempt to classify the races of mankind must be founded on an evolutionary basis.¹ There are fully differentiated races—pandiacritic races—in which every member is recognisable at sight by an expert. There are races where we can distinguish about 70% of its members, and so on down the scale, through macrodiacritic stages, mesodiaccritic, microdiaccritic until we reach the zero diaccritic stage. All are races in a strictly biological sense; all are stages of an evolutionary scale.

Sir Arthus Keith accepts Huxley's verdict that the chief racial types may be reduced to four—the Nordic type of Europe, the Negroid of Africa, the Mongolian of Eastern Asia and the aboriginal type of Australia. The others are hybrids produced by the intermingling of these four types. If evolution is true we ought to find human races in every stage of differentiated racial types, but there are nationalities and peoples which represent every stage in the process of differentiation from a zero-point upwards.

It may be noted that people are far less adaptable to great changes in culture-form and mode of living that they have not evolved or adapted to suit themselves than is generally supposed. All real and permanent advance in culture is brought about by that form of relation which ensures high specialisation or the preservation of the highly specialized types whose influence determines the culture level of a people. Adaptability is a purely psycho-physical question. There is no correlation between

¹ Sir Arthur Keith, "The Evolution of the Human Races," *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, Vol. LVIII, 1928; See Frank H. Hankins, *The Racial Basis of Civilisation*, p. 817, 1928.

either the incidence of the mortality of diseases and the survival or disappearance of a racial strain.¹

In the great nations of modern Europe with their heterogeneous populations and mixed ancestry, the diversity of culture and culture potential between different classes and groups and even between different individuals of the same class may well exceed the differences between many centuries of growth in more homogeneous societies. A close study of demographic facts shows that the supposed ability to "raise a people in culture level," as also the phenomenon of a degradation of culture is, in either case, dependent upon a blood substitution in the population. The inevitable result of destroying all culture-forms and environmental conditions in the endeavour to impose too dissimilar a culture upon a people specialised by a long process of adaptation to particular conditions is actually to exterminate them. All missionary endeavour among the savage peoples will in the end assist in the extermination of the people it professes to assist.

Every conceivable side interest, prejudice and false analogy is discussed in the name of the native problem. Western civilization has assumed control of the destinies of the dark-skinned people but it has failed to stabilise the relation between subject and ruling race and between two incompatible cultures. Pitt-Rivers maintains that the native problem and its attendant problem of native unrest is complementary or alternative to the problem of native decrease and extinction. The native problem might be defined as "The problem created by the survival of those native races or their hybrid descendants that have not been exterminated by the 'blessings of civilization.'" There is no native problem in Tasmania. In truth, the Tasmanians are not alive to create the native problem.

In North America the white-race fears the consequences of the rapid increase of the negro stock which is in danger of outbreeding it. The white colonists of South Africa are growing conscious of a similar threat. In the sweltering islands of Melanesia and Polynesia,² the races which are in the whites' interest to preserve are being fast exterminated. This worldwide phenomenon of recalcitrant black races is sometimes referred to as the native problem, and sometimes by Stoddart's

¹ See Seligman and Bryant "Mental Development of the South African Review, Vol. ix.

² W. H. R. Rivers, *Essays on the Depopulation of Melanesia* pp. 20, 23, 50, 52,

more dramatic figure of speech "The Rising Tide of Colour."¹ The Eskimo is less anxiously regarded because his number is fast dwindling. In India there is the tumult and agitation for national independence. In China the anti-foreigner and anti-Christian agitation is gathering fresh momentum. In New Guinea the problem is newest. This unrest all over the Pacific, in America, The Cape, Natal and India before the war is emphasised by and since the war. It is a revolt against European tutelage. In South Africa and America it is the mixed-bloods that led the revolt. Dr. W. E. Burghardt du Bois regards all coloured people as inevitably hostile to the whites and predicts world-wide rebellion.

In South Africa in 1922 the strike-riots developed into an abortive revolution. The Bolsheviks are deeply interested in the "oppressed black workers of South Africa." At the third International held in Moscow, on the 7th August, 1920 Radek stated "The Communist International must serve as a pillar of fire leading on the rebellious people in Asia and Africa." The utilisation and manipulation of existing racial antagonisms is their policy. It is hoped that the Oriental University at Moscow "will grow into a Grand Mecca of the young militants of the Orient and Africa, then they will fit themselves not merely for the task of revolt, but for the task of communist reconstruction."²

This is not the place to pursue this development further nor is it needful for us to study the strenuous debates carried on since the eighteenth century over the Anglacing Programme—the one nostrum that can cure all the ills of the native spirit. We may here trace in a few main points the coming trends of a movement of emancipation, growing ever stronger and penetrating ever deeper. In North America the fundamental problem is the future of 12 million negroes and the outlook justifies Washington's prediction "the problem is not so much what the white man will do with the negro as what the negro will do with the white man and his civilization." The theory that the negro will determine the constitutional development of the United States does not lack important exponents.

According to J. W. Gregory, in South Africa the future rests with a composite Iberian-India-Negro race. The European

¹ L. Stoddart, *The Rising Tide of Colour*, p. 27.

² See K. Dudley, *Kafir Socialism*. pp. 25, 208.

element in South America will be upraised by the admixture of the Indian. Mr. Gregory decidedly states "In Asia the political autocracy of the white man is clearly doomed. We should accept the change with the pleasure of a parent at the independence of a competent son, and not with the irritation of a nurse at a fractious infant."¹ In Africa the ultimate supremacy of the negro over most of the continent appears inevitable. Professor Griffith Taylor feels that the infusion of the Chinese blood would improve the Australian race.

The ethical basis of civilization has been provided by the Asiatic to whom is due all the high religions—Hinduism, Christianity, Confucianism and Islam. The view is sometimes expressed that there is no real difference between European people and other races, because no absolute dividing-line can be drawn between them. The future progress of mankind, therefore, requires the conference of individuals than association in man.

Julian Huxley regards race mixture in the past as beneficial.² Then he draws the picture of how the British contain a definite mixture of Mediterranean types. In the Germans there is a very large Eurasiatic element which includes the Slavonic, while hereditary elements from the Mongoloid people have come from Russia. In France the population is largely Alpine but there is a strong admixture in the North and prevailing Mediterranean element in the South. America is a melting pot. The Japanese are a mixture of several ethnic types. India is a product of repeated invasions.

He rightly remarks that the violent racialism to be found in Europe today is a symptom of Europe's exaggerated nationalism. The cure for the racial mythology, with its accompanying self-exaltation and persecution, which now besets Europe is reorientation of the nationalist ideal. He describes racialism as a myth and a dangerous myth: "It is a cloak for selfish economic aims which in their uncloaked nakedness would look ugly enough. The essence of science is the appeal to fact, and all the facts are against the existence in Modern Europe of anything in the nature of separate human race."

A peaceful solution of racial conflicts demands equal opportunities for all races in all occupations and professions and equal

¹ J. W. Gregory, *The Menace of Colour*, p. 287, 1925.

² Julian Huxley, "Race" in *Europe*, pp. 30, 31, 1939.

rights in the exercise of citizenship. It cannot be attained without increased facilities for the backward races in education, in capital equipment and in the development of their interest. Outside the Soviet Union no decisive change in the attitude and practices of dominant races toward backward races is in prospect. A deep change in the mind and spirit of man must take place, otherwise wars and race-riots will supervene.

The New Social Order must be creative and orderly. The vision of the social planners must be animated and warmed by the moral feeling. The obstructing beliefs and tendencies must be overcome. It must be the manifestation of a vitality which surges up and spreads impetuously. Vitality is not civilization or morality, but without it civilization or morality will lack the necessary bases, the vital material needed to give moral and civil form and direction. The individual must be enabled to become better, purer and more intelligent at his work. Then he will realise that in all these raptures, follies, childish vanities and mania of destruction, there is human and moral reasonableness.

The New Social Order must idolize "the errand-men of the spirit of the world," who contribute ideas to humanity, or forms of beauty, scientific discoveries, the institutions and sentiments which will make the civilization and mark the differences between human and animal life. But we cannot on this account forget that the idolization of dictators is a base affection, not of citizens but fawning courtiers. The culture heralded by the noble German spirits of a better age—Herder, Humboldt and Goethe is superior to the exaltation of naked force by the Third Reich. Therefore, the New Social Order should go on creating within the confines of history new moral, religious, intellectual and aesthetic forms, and thus laying the foundations and forging the material of what is more specially human or civilized.

The state exists to provide the necessary conditions of stability for the developing of the highest spiritual achievements. It will be poorer in ideal motive if its wells of spiritual and social life are dried up. Then the state-mechanism must be directed in the operation and practice of ethics in politics. The essence of the state consists in the unity of a common life, which, as in the case of natural organisms, results from the harmonious coherence of parts, which are properly differentiated,

disposed and vested with special functions. And from this principle was developed the conception of individuals as members of the living collective body. In this organic theory the constitution is the organization which unites the many into a one, the constitutional powers are organic functions, the branches vested with these functions are organs and the ruler is the highest governing organ which every organism requires.

The Hindu view of social life based on the four-fold order of society (Varna), the man of learning (Brahman), of power (Kshatriya), of skilled productivity (Vaisya) and of service (Sudra) was not an atomistic and mechanical construction of society.¹ In this social scheme the natural hierarchy was preserved not by blandishments or by menaces but by love and with the collaboration of love. The sage, the hero, the artist and the servant drew their inspiration and strength from the same fount and represented different functions in actuation. The impulses of practical and moral life were carefully balanced and fostered. Sir S. Radhakrishnan² expressly says "To aspire to a universality through his mind and reason, his heart and love, through his will and power, is the high sense of his humanity. Ethical life is the means to spiritual freedom, as well as its expression on earth."

The four-fold order of classification: spiritual wisdom, executive power, skilled production and devoted service rose out of function, out of the need to clarify and newly determine ideals of function. Only those who are self-conscious and not conscious of their function, should throw away the keys given to this social hieroglyphic.

The social organization was based on the specialization of aptitudes and habits in different spheres of life and therefore the relative closure of one against the other was inevitable. It was occasionally lifted or suspended, otherwise specializations would have become separations and being thus sterilized would have destroyed the social mechanism and its parts. From his fixed position the individual moved into action. The social planners in India were aware that a crystallized, fixed and static social activity, without fluidity would lose its creativeness and value. Therefore, in their plan there was always an invitation

¹ Sir George Birdwood says "So long as the Hindus hold to the caste system, India will be India; but from the day they break from it, there will be no more India. That glorious peninsula will be degraded to the position of a bitter "East End" of the Anglo-Saxon Empire" (S v a, p. 29).

² S. Radhakrishnan, *Eastern Religions and Western Thought*, 1989,

to rise with every movement from one scale to another which was higher and more exacting. It produced a type and provided for growth beyond it. This ordering of relations was in the interests of a larger freedom.

This social order was a preparation for utopia, a design for a rational and harmonious life, a secure hope in a definite peace. It gave its members a vision which bound them together in the unity of life and reality. In this sense there was an ascent and a realized progress. We may assign to it three qualities: democracy, spiritual equality and a consideration to others. It promoted the unity of social life and led to the creation of works of truth.

According to Professor Joad,¹ the distinctive ends and purposes of man can be summed up under the search for knowledge the pursuit of goodness and the cultivation of beauty. The state should seek to promote but emphatically it should not seek to prescribe. It should put a man in touch with abler intelligence and provide the citizen with a trained and critical intelligence. Its principal aims should be the free activity of the human mind, the increase of moral virtue and the cultivation of good taste and skill in the art of living.

The substitution of the principle of birth for virtue made the classes degenerate into castes. The task that confronts the future social planners is to weave the varied, the diverse and the opposite social forces into a web of functional reality. In this respect, the conception of Hindu Social Life should warm their hearts and point the way.

¹ C. E. M. Joad, *For Civilization*, 1940.

9

A NEW MORAL ORDER

THE HUMAN ideas of morality, socialism and peace must become reflexes, anchored deeply in every human being. According to Pavlov,¹ this can be done by a judicious formation of appropriate conditional reflexes, by propaganda and above all by education.

A highly emotive propaganda keeps the masses alert, heightens their courage, produces explosions of enthusiasm and inspires acts of heroism. Propaganda by persuasion to militants and propaganda by suggestion for masses must be cleverly arranged. For the former doctrine is essential and for the latter mysticism. It is vital to remember that propaganda cannot be confined to negation.

So long as the people believe in the immutability of outmoded dogmas there will be no positive advance. Those who hope to march to the conquest of better times should make Active Socialism their purpose and slogan. It aims at liberating humanity from its psychical servitude and protects it from psychical rape. It regards the moral factor of the human behaviour as an equivalent of the material factors.

The method of psychical rape is adopted by Mussolini and Hitler for negative and anti-human aims of national isolation and war. In order to build up socialism and true democracy rapidly, Mr. Serge Chakotin suggests "it will be needful to employ the same method of procured obsession, acting in this case no longer on fear but on enthusiasm, joy and love. A violent propaganda of non-violence."²

Rousseau and his disciples are profoundly convinced that altruism is biologically inept; culture creates the altruist idea; hence, culture is biologically negative. This is the syllogism of

¹ I. Pavlov, *Conditioned Reflexes: An Investigation of the Physiological activity of the cerebral cortex*, 1927.

² Serge Chakotin, *The Rape of the Masses*, p. 273, 1940.

Pessimism. The advocates of "compensated pessimism" argue that it would be better to renounce perfect biological health than the spiritual felicity the individual gains from culture. In every case this compensation may not come. Even then, there is something that takes its place, the great myth of human liberty, which has exceptional dynamic and suggestive force.¹

Le Bon predicted that the advent of the crowd would mark one of the last stages of the western civilization, a return to the periods of confusion and anarchy, which would precede the emergence of new societies. The characteristic of our age is, on the contrary, the diminution of the real influence of collectives on public life. By the method of psychical rape, the dictators have unscrupulously made use of their intuitive apprehensions of psychological laws, together with their control of the formidable technical equipment to convert the collectives into docile instruments. Hitler's Nuremberg Congress and Mussolini's harangues from his balcony are designed to exploit the forces inherent in the crowd. The dictators periodically pluck the strings which can be made to vibrate in the masses by appeals to fear or enthusiasm.

The dictatorial regime always comprises two essential phases of action; (1) the gathering of masses into crowds, where they can be subjected to the psychical lash of the whip by means of violent harangues, associated with the exhibition of certain symbols, which reawaken their faith in these symbols (2) the dispersal of these crowds into masses who are then left for a time to act under the revived influence of the symbols, which surround them on all sides. The leader controls and canalises the roused passions towards a salutary end. It is to be understood that a crowd is always a mass, but a mass of individuals is not necessarily a crowd.

Modern political propaganda makes its appeal to the masses. In Charles Baudoin's phrase "Psychogogy"² the practical science of the direction of the activities of other people through the action of influences designed with reference to their psychical mechanisms, has become manifest in the Fascist States. In Gandhi's hand it has become a social duty by which he leads men towards social activity.

¹ "Certain ideologies and certain myths seem to be indestructible, and centuries pass without witnessing their decline. They have been based on certain 'constants' of the human heart, and thus call forth an echo at all times."

(H. Arthur, *La Genèse des Mythes*, 1938).

² Charles Baudoin, "Obituary of Alfred Alder," *Action et Pensée*, 1937, No. 2.

A crowd is capable of delirious enthusiasm, incredible cowardice and sublime heroism. It acts only under leadership, when manipulated by "soul engineers."¹ An instance of the possibility of manipulating crowds by means of psychological weapons is provided by Russia. After the Bolsheviks came into power, the excited crowds frequently attacked people in the street on the strength of suspicion aroused by anyone present. The persons attacked were lynched. To obviate this danger the intellectuals evolved a method of psychological action. A "Fraternal Aid Service" was created and if anyone was attacked in the street the members of this organisation rushed to the nearest telephone and informed the Fraternal Aid Office. The propaganda specialists made at top speed in their cars to the point indicated. They pushed their way at different points into the crowd round the person in peril and began to take part in the shouting, each independently of the rest, and each trying to attract attention to himself. These experienced agitators became new centres of interest to the crowd, so that the imperilled man, could efface himself and escape with his life. This organisation was also known as the "Spiritual Aid Service" and it proved its value. A thing characteristic of the crowd is the preponderance of emotional over intellectual appeal.

There are four instincts at the root of all behaviour; struggle, nutrition, sexuality and maternity and it is possible to build up systems of conditional reflexes on each of these bases. Based on these reflexes it is possible to envisage evolution either upward or downward—sublimation or degradation. The social idea, the philosophic idea, art and science are the four great groups of the conquest of social life. Their excessive developments are degeneracies and lead to complexes which are negative from the social points of view. Philosophy might lose itself in speculation, socialism might degenerate into anarchist extravagances and science might become the amoral servant of profit-seeking industry.

Christ's system is built on the maternal instinct, since compassion and neighbourly love are extended forms of maternal love. Karl Marx based his philosophy on the second instinct,

¹ K. Hesse prophesied that "Germany would find her Fuehrer in her psychological Grand Master. Thus a day will come when he will announce himself. Hundreds of thousands of minds are filled with his effigy, millions of voices invoke him constantly, the whole soul of Germany is seeking him whence will he come? No one knows. Perhaps from a prince's palace. Perhaps from a worker's shanty. But each one knows; it is he, the Fuehrer; each one will acclaim him; each one will obey him. And why? Because an extraordinary power emanates from his person; he is the director of souls. That is why his name will be Marshal Psychologos."

(Kurt Hesse, *Der Feldherr Psychologos. A Search for the Leader of the German Future*, 1922).

nutrition. The dictators have based their thirst for domination on the instinct of struggle. Freudism which sees all human behaviour from the single angle of sexuality has done injury to these theories and is therefore rejected. Adler, the principal opponent of Freud, traces all phenomena of human behaviour to the will to dominate, the lust for power (*Machttrieb*).¹ These combative tendencies are expressed by rapacity, envy and the pursuit of superiority.

Adler spoke of World War I as the "most terrible of the collective neurosis into which our neuropathic civilization has been thrown by its will to power and its policy of prestige. It reveals itself as the devilish work of the lust for domination unloosed everywhere, stifling the immortal sentiment of human solidarity or turning it to perverted uses." Neurosis, according to Adler, is a disturbance of social character. Now the Hitlerist symbols have turned many people into neurotics."

The great struggle which has now begun in the world is the struggle between two systems of equal psychical force—since both are based on the combative instinct. One of these is fascism, a hybrid monster, born out of the machinations of capitalism in its dying hour and from the inertia of the labour movement. The other force is the activist socialist system. Struggle is as old as man or as life. In biology struggle means resistance to all sorts of factors that menace existence. It may assume an aggressive or defensive form. Pain is a mechanism of warning with which each individual is provided. In association with other excitations, especially visual ones, it takes the form of menace. When becomes effectual it sets in operation flight. This is the simplest form of psychical violence.

A geometrical diagram like the Swastika or Union Jack is a menace by means of a symbol. The phenomena involved are known in biology as fascination and mimicry for terrorization. An orthopterous insect, the praying mantis, when it parts its anterior limbs, assumes a spectral appearance, and by its bizarre form and its rigidity fascinates the small animals it feeds on.

The victim sometimes exerts a sort of psychical violence over the aggressor. Cuenot² gives this example: "The caterpillar of *Choerocampa elpenor* (a butterfly) has on two of its segments oculiform markings surrounded by black circles. If it is alarmed,

1 A. Adler, *Le temperament nerveux*, 1926.

2 L. Cuenot, *La Genese des especes animales*, 1911.

it retracts its anterior rings; the fore is greatly expanded, and the effect created is that of the head of a snake, an illusion the sudden appearance of which can terrify lizards and small birds."

Propaganda based on fear always takes effect more easily with men whose economic situation is precarious. Active fear results in obtuseness and loss of sensibility. Military training tends to check fear.¹ A state of tension also brings fear. This phenomena was noticeable in France at the time of the historic events of 1938. At 4 p.m., on September 28, at the announcement of the Munich Conference, a violent collective psychological crisis spread all over Europe.

Fear may become panic in a multitude. Troups disband if a single person shouts "We are lost" *Sauve qui Peut*. The prime purpose of the uniform is maintenance of discipline or physical organisation. The goose-step of Germans gives them at once the appearance of perfect automata "robots." This is the mechanism of psychical rape which is the aim of all dictators.


Discipline, as defined by official regulations "consists solely in obedience to rules of subordination and meticulous performance of prescribed gestures as outward marks of respect to superiors." The purpose of discipline is the repression of fear. As Reguert says, discipline means "not to train parrots but to form men." Rational discipline aims not at destroying personality but co-ordinating efforts.

Rhythm produces a state related to somnambulism and hypnosis. The military organisation in a totalitarian state pursues this aim. The Greek shout (*alala!*), the Roman *clamour* the Teuton *bardict*, the Indian *Jai* were of this type. All these have certain element of wild and tense melody. When the leaders enter the Congress Hall at Nuremberg, a rattle of drums on a foundation of Wagnerian music is heard. The masses howl with racous strident voices. The '*Marseillaise*' is a sublime evocator of the grandeur of the human soul in readiness for sacrifice. The "*Vande Mataram*" is vibrant with ecstasy, scintillating with courage—a source of true enthusiasm.

A constant effort, a true training, associated with conditioned excitation of a higher order, with reasoning, creates courage. The rumbling fire, the artillery barrage, the air attack and the war of gases call for self-mastery.

¹ Capitaine Reguert, *Les Forces Morales*, 1987.

A political movement needs a stenographic form of the expression of its ideas, a symbol of its own, by means of which it may spread rapidly. History furnishes many examples of symbols: the Swastika, the Cross, the Roman "S.P.Q.R.," the Crescent, the Lion, the Eagle, etc. The Red Flag and the term "comrade" have played a very important part in the socialist movement. In politics symbols are usually simple representation of ideas or an abstract system of doctrines. This diagram illustrates the relation between the political symbol and its contents:



The symbol is suggested in proportion to its effectiveness. It transmits the active idea associated with the movement. However, the Swastika is an old Hindu symbol with no reference whatever to Nazi Socialism. As a sound symbol of menace and as retort to the Nazi "Heil Hitler" the Socialists employed the shout of 'Freiheit" (Freedom). Ironically they shouted 'Heil Hitler" (Heal Hitler). The idea is embodied in the symbol to Polarize men's activity in a particular direction.

The myth has a social tendency "by favour of society and in its favour." The Communist symbol—the hammer and sickle represents the constructive idea of the proletarian state. Roger Caillois says "The myth belongs to the collective, it justifies, sustains and inspires the existence of a community, be it a people or a professional body or a secret society."

Hitler attained power by means of psychical violence. He has unconsciously, by intuition, applied to the political battle, the laws defined by Pavlov. Lenin and Hitler are the great

1 Roger Caillois, *Le Mythe et l'Homme*, 1938.

propagandists of our time. Lenin wrote "The revolutionary propagandists must think in terms of hundreds, the agitator in terms of hundreds of thousands and the leader of the revolution in terms of millions." Hitler says to the recalcitrant "If you do not join our ranks, so be it, but we shall get your children."¹ Mussolini has his "Balillas," baby Fascists. Files of white gloved children march through the Italian streets to the beating of the drums. Hitler distinguishes between functions of organisation and propaganda. He popularised the slogan "Hitler over Europe" by speaking at four or five widely separated towns on the same day. He makes use of individual and group caricatures, street song, leaflets, and pictorial posters as effective instruments of propaganda.² He uses luminous colour effects during his speeches. He believes in "persuasion by force," that means, psychical rape by means of emotive propaganda based on fear. His propaganda is characterised by three elements: the ignoring of moral considerations, the appeal to the emotions of the masses by the use of the combative instinct as the basis, and the employment of conditional reflexes inducing conformity in the masses.

The principle adopted by Mussolini is bluff, menace, instilling fear into the masses, and producing ecstasy and wild excitement in the crowds.³ The very symbol of fascism fascio, is the symbol of violence. The legend of the origin of the fascio is that in the 6th century B.C., Brutus, first Consul of Rome, had his son publicly beaten with rods and executed with an axe for plotting against the state. Mussolini has a boundless belief in violence. He confessed to Ludwig "After me, the deluge."

Those who knew the inner springs of Hitler's behaviour wanted Britain to adopt a policy of firmness and not of war. It was Chamberlain and his Conservative majority that were responsi-

1 W. Munzenberg, *Propaganda als Waffe*, 1937.

2 Hitlerist propaganda plays on nationalist and chauvinist catch phrases; the Legend of the "stab in the back," during the Great war, "the ignominious peace of Versailles," "the November Criminals," etc. At the Nuremberg Congress of 1935 Hitler exclaimed "If ever I decide to attack an enemy, I shall not do like Mussolini; I shall not enter into discussions and take months to prepare, but I shall do what I always have done throughout my life; I shall pounce on my adversary like a stroke of lightning at night." This is the language of intimidation carried to frenzy.

Hitler never speaks in the conditional tense. "Only the imperative maintains the psychosis of power among friends and the psychosis of terror among enemies." (Paul M. G. Levy "Psychology and Political Propaganda; the German Experience" *Revue de l'Institut de Sociologie*, 1933, vol. xiii, No. 3, p. 556).

Hitler declared in a speech to women "when we come into power, every German woman will have a husband." (W. Munzenberg, *Propaganda als Waffe*, 1937).

3 The specific method of violence of Mussolini is the castor oil. Once he wrote "This man disgusts me; but before I am overcome by nausea, I want to bash him till the blood runs." (Louis Roy, *Histoire de Mussolini*).

ble for the Munich capitulation. On the evening of September 26, it was announced "Great Britain and Russia will certainly stand by France." The whole effect of this declaration was destroyed by the statement issued by Chamberlain the next morning "I have read the speech of the German Chancellor, and I appreciate his reference to the efforts I have made to save the peace. I cannot abandon those efforts."

The sole means of smashing the Hitlerist hoodoo was to copy it. The consequences of Munich were grave, a German hegemony in Central Europe was almost secured, France was isolated and Mussolini's position was strengthened. Czechoslovakia was not even admitted to the discussion of her fate. She was only noticed of the sentence.¹

Psychological freedom is a human acquisition, one of the higher conditional reflexes, a product of culture. It is not enough to state that the ultimate interest of the struggle is freedom. It is partly of propagandist interest. Propaganda will have to make use of the psychical levers to influence nine-tenths of the population. A rational propaganda is necessary to influence the remaining one-tenth. The essential idea must be defined.

Mr. Rowse says that in Germany a struggle is going on for the German soul.² On the one side the forces of reason and culture, of science and the will to co-operate and on the other the denial of reason and culture, the cult of violence and aggression and the inflamed inferiority-complex are ranged. In the latter sense Hitler is the very mirror of the German soul, hence his astonishing success. Germans have cut themselves off from western civilization and have sought, refuge in the depths of their own hideous Teutonism. Mr. Rowse, in his zeal for British virtue, forgets that their worst imperialist faults are made a special doctrine.

He exclaims "what a pity for Germans that they were not conquered by Rome!". He feels that if Germany had come within the pale of Roman civilization, she could not have resisted now Europe. He discovers dichotomy in the German soul. On the one hand there is Luther, the aposite of unreasoning faith, of thinking with the bowels, of nationalism and force;

1 A. Fabre-Luce, *Histoire secret de la Conciliation de Munich*, 1938.

2 A. L. Rowse, "What is wrong with the Germans?" *The Political Quarterly*, January-March, 1940.

in short Germanism. On the other is seen Erasmus, the protagonist of reason, of tolerance and reform, of peace and a Christian international order, in essence a true European. It is a matter of great historic significance that their famous controversy was carried on the question of freedom of the will. At the time of Enlightenment, there is the same dichotomy between the pacific cosmopolitanism of Kant and the calculated fraud of the prussian Frederick. Again a marked contrast exists between the great European Goethe and the loathsome megalomaniac Hegel, between the *blut und eisen politik* of Bismarck and the futurian internationalism of Marx. In recent times there is the sharp contrast between the hopes of social progress and friendly co-operation raised by the effete Weimar Republic and the lapse into the deliberate terrorism of the Nazis and their denial of political morality.

Mr. Rowse raises an important issue when he observes that it is impossible to acquit a nation for the way it is governed. He should know that the sovereign people are nowhere given sovereign responsibility. The plea of Mr. Rowse that it is unreal to make a complete disjunction between the Nazis and the German people is unsound. The Germans, he argues, are a frontierless people and the effect has been to make them emphasise their unity as a *Volk* speaking the same language. To say that the Germine mind holds a threat for European civilization is unwarranted.

It is argued that no country in the world had such a galaxy of thinkers who believed in the assertion of the will as against reason, the state as the *terminus ad quem* of all politics, the futility and even the unmorality of international peace as Germany:—Fischte, Herder, Arndt, Schlegel, Hegel, Treitschke, Clausewitz, Nietzsche, Houston Chamberlain, Bernhardt, Spengler, Rosenberg, Hitler and Goebbels. Nazism is but the latest version of that tradition, coarsened and jazzed-up to appeal to the total lack of any cultural standards in the lower middle-class. It is this tradition translated into the language of the Hollywood.

To say that the Germans are a singularly gullible people, while the British are an exceptionally sensible race is grotesque. In Mr. Rowse's opinion the Germans can never tell a good egg from a bad egg, whether in politics, or art or life. No other people on earth would have believed in the congealed nonsense of these thinkers. The intelligence of the French, the common-sense of

the English and the scepticism of the Italians would never have stood it. In decadent France, the intelligence of the people is like wax in the hands of a Petain or a Laval. The sceptical Italians have allowed their land to become a land of German occupation. And the German people are to be gulled in order to be led.

The way in which force has been applied to human relations has been differently conceived in the historical periods. Till the advent of the Nazis to power it was held that the communal control of power and the elimination of violence from human and social relations were desirable. This belief in some cases was not a mere utopian aspiration. In the nineteenth century the power of kings over subjects, of aristocrats over commoners and of men over women was rigidly limited. It was commonly believed that it was possible to control or modify the use of power and canalise it for an intelligent purpose. This attitude was closely associated with the practice and theory of nineteenth century liberalism. The war of 1914 reversed this ethical process of sublimating violence.

War between sovereign states is "power politics." It entails the adoption of violence as a basic factor in determining human relations. Conversely it means the rejection of conversion, compromise, discussion, law or other non-violent procedures.

The League of Nations was an academic dream of President Wilson. Unfortunately the statesmen of Versailles thought themselves realists and the League was an Utopia. The failure of this colossal experiment in human relations was due to the attitude of the post-war thinkers towards power and violence.

Professor E. H. Carr illicitly argues that the international policy of the nineteenth century liberalism collapsed because it was based on the promotion of the common interests of states and not on the conflict of state interests. That means, conflicting interests or power are real, harmony of interests or political interests of co-operation are non-existent and therefore unreal. This kind of attitude is rooted in muddled-thinking. Mr. Leonard Woolf rightly points out that the political reality of interests does not depend upon people's consciousness of them, but on the relative effects of different actions and different patterns of social organisation.¹ It would be interesting to learn

¹ Leonard Woolf, "Utopia and Reality," *The Political Quarterly*, April-June, 1940.
See also E. H. Carr, *Conditions of Peace*, 1942.

which of the Great Powers really profitted by their ruthless pursuits in the years 1790, 1815, 1914, and 1939. Those who advocate the philosophy of violence are continually reading the burial service over democracy and decency.

If the criterion of utopianism is attainability, then it depends upon three elements: a psychology, the creation of the social machinery appropriate to the purpose and to the psychology. Man never accepts the facts and his frauds. He finds the fig-leaf of a theory or a philosophy to cover his guilty ambition. When the design is frustrated he offers *ex post facto* consolatory explanations. He talks loosely of illusions, shams, utopias, and realities. To the Nazi war-lords, democracy is a sham and dictatorship a reality. To the Anglo-Saxon Big Business, colonial freedom is an illusion and Indirect Rule, a practical achievement.

The term utopia should contain a purpose or is based upon a hope or an ideal which is incapable of fulfilment and it is in this sense opposed to realism. It is also used in the sense of "unreal" as opposed to "reality." The two senses are not the same and in political controversies they are invariably confused. Some theorists in indecent haste accept power and conflict as the essential elements in social organisation. And they cover the results of this psychology with the fig-leaf of a theory. In their eyes the resolution of international conflicts and promotion of the common interests of states or nations is utopian. It follows that any attempt which aims at organising the relations of states upon the basis of their common and not conflicting interests is bound to fizzle out.

Five hundred years of European history have proved that the "realist" system of power politics is ridiculously utopian. Loud-voiced jingoism and national glory have resulted in war, misery, and impoverishment. Power politics and stable society are opposed to each other. It ignores the reality of facts and forces. In 1940, Britain and Russia had a large number of common and a large number of conflicting interests. In an atmosphere of war the Anglo-Russian alliance was made. This fact torpedoes Professor Carr's argument about utopianism and reality in international affairs. The Pact was determined by psychology and not by power.

There is a great volume of opinion today which believes in the outlawry of war. The three expedients for preventing war are; *first*, strengthening collective security, *secondly*, pacifism

and *thirdly* the nationalisation of the munition industry. War may be defined as an armed conflict between sovereign states. It is a struggle of will between states or a combination of states. Peace is not a negative condition, in which war is not waged.

It is that state in which disputes are settled by constitutional means and resort to violence by contending parties is prohibited. The state can create an organically united community and by itself it cannot eschew violence. Nor can it exist without the ultimate coercive power. Says the Marquis of Lothian "If you asked an intelligent citizen to name the principal causes of war, he would probably choose some among the following causes: unjust treaties, racial or religious or cultural differences, maltreatment of minorities, need for raw materials or markets, imperialist ambition, strategic considerations or the arms traffic, and he might end with one or two omnibus words, capitalism or nationalism. I venture to think that none of these things are the fundamental causes of war."¹ Continuing the noble Lord makes the astounding statement "Empire gives unity and with unity peace." Here is the convincing reply of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: "The very basis of the imperialist state is coercion of subject peoples and their exploitation; inevitably this is resented and attempts are made to overthrow this domination. On this basis no peace can be founded. One cannot distinguish between the two conceptions of Fascism and Empire, and that Fascism is indeed an intensified form of the same system which is imperialism. We also find imperialist countries gradually drifting from democracy at home."

In a mechanised world in which the appeal to force still lies at the back of international relationship, the 56 sovereign states of the world which are utterly unable to defend their frontiers are anachronisms. Therefore, any system which is based on the contractual co-operation of states will lead back to anarchy and war. The delegates in the League of Nations considered every problem as a conflict of national points of view. The League failed to create a world patriotism and it could neither raise taxes nor command the loyalty of individual citizens. The sovereign units invariably fail to act in concert. Therefore, the League was incapable of either decision or action. Neither the League Council nor the Assembly could revise any treaty, modify any tariff or remodel the political or economic structure, except with the voluntary consent of the states immediately concerned.

¹ Marquis of Lothian, *Pacifism is not Enough*, p. 11, 1941.

Disarmament proved ineffective as the sovereign states desired to maintain the political *status quo*. Further the League can only apply sanctions if it is ready for war. In other words, it is a system which aims at waging collective wars instead of national wars.¹

A peace system cannot be created on the basis of coercion. The only basis is the limitation of sovereignty for supra-national purposes. The present conflicts are global in their essential nature. Therefore, the dictum of Canning "Every nation for itself and the devil take the hindmost" is suicidal. The member-states of the League tried to assure their own security by their neighbours' insecurity. The League failed to turn the international traffic lights from "stop" to "go." In such a net-work of alliances race for armed supremacy became a continuation of policy.

The air-arm has made the time factor decisive. It can paralyse mobilisation, munition supplies or food production. Millions of persons shelter themselves in tight rat-holes or rat-infested tubes. Air disarmament is possible if military air forces are abolished and the civilian aircraft is internationalised. Lord Davies suggested the creation of a tribunal of equality to adjudicate on all matters which cannot be settled by agreement and an international force capable of enforcing the decisions and of preventing war. If the 56 sovereign states are ready for this step then they are ready for federation.

The creation of a world federation must be spiritual movement. A political institution to endure must have an ethical basis. The limitation of force is indicated in the statement of Admiral Mahan "The function of force is to give time for moral ideas to take root." The moral process must end in an organic union. The people may be driven to unity by bitter suffering. Recently and rightly an American pacifist divine circularised 20,000 ministers of religion in the United States, of whom 14,000 replied that they believed that the Christian Churches should refuse to sanction or support any future war, 13,000 replied that it was their present intention to refuse to participate in future war as combatants, and 8,000 replied that they would refuse to serve as Chaplains. Says the divine "we shall be absolute non-co-operators in the process of war and shall willingly go to jail for our conviction."

¹ See J. L. Brierly, *The Law of Nations : an Introduction to the International Law of Peace*, 1928, T. P. Conwell—Evans, *The League Council in action*; 1929; various Authors, *Problem of Peace*, IV volumes, 1927; L. S. Woolf, *International Government*, 1927; *Imperialism and Civilisation*, 1928.

The moral crisis of the present epoch is the breakdown of the system of ethics based on harmony of interest.¹ This doctrine had its source in the nationalism of the eighteenth century which explained human behaviour in terms of an orderly behaviour controlled by scientific mechanism. The nineteenth century philosophers like Hegel and Marx also emphasised the process rather than the end. This conception of rational morality of the harmony of interests influenced very little the tendencies of the period. It is the puritan tradition that built up the *Laissez-Faire* society of the nineteenth century. The passage of the restrictive immigration law of 1923 by the American Congress sealed the doom of liberal democracy and *laissez-faire*.

Shorn of its ethical basis, nationalism degenerated into the morally purposeless cult of the super-man. God became the Yes-Man of the Fuehrer. The social system dispensed with the concept of moral purpose. Sacrifice for a recognised common good became slaving for the tyrant's dream of a Universal Empire.

The great lights of the human mind are Liberty, Law and Love. These are ultimate values which make possible a just and enduring peace. According to Croce, liberty is the eternal creator of history and itself the subject of every history.² As such it is the explanatory principle of the course of history as well as the moral ideal of humanity. Nowadays we frequently hear jubilant announcements, resigned admissions or desperate lamentations that the ideal of liberty has set on the horizon of history, in a sunset without promise of sunrise. Croce observes "Those who talk or write or print this deserve the pardon pronounced by Jesus, 'for they know not what they say.' To assert that liberty is dead is the same thing as saying that life is dead. Nothing can replace the ideal of liberty ; "there is no other like it, none which makes the heart of man, in his human quality, so beat, none other which responds better to the very law of life which is history ; and that this calls for an ideal in which liberty is accepted and respected and so placed as to achieve ever greater achievements."

The liberal order which was the unique achievement of the nineteenth century has tumbled and in some countries the desire

1 E. H. Carr, *Conditions of Peace*, p. 102, 1942.

2 Benedetto Croce, *History as the Story of Liberty*, p. 59, 1941.



for its collapse is spreading. In the tumult of oppression, barbarian invasion, brigandage, ecclesiastical tyrannies, exiles and gallows "an unquiet, uncertain, disordered liberty with brief intervals of unrest, rare and lightning moments of a happiness perceived rather than possessed," has appeared. In the light of this grim truth the statement of Hegel that all history is the history of liberty sounds like irony.

The man who deprives the liberty of another wakes in him awareness of himself and enlivens him to seek for liberty. It is equally true that a liberal order, securely established and undisputed, will decay into habit and thereby its original self-awareness and readiness for defence is weakened. In Greece, in the fourth century, liberty was preserved in the outward form but not in the soul or the customs of the people and thus lost those forms.

A Napoleon destroys a merely apparent and nominal liberty and leaves those same people with a thirst for liberty and a new awareness of what it really was. Says Croce "Even in the darkest and crassest times liberty trembles in the lines of poets and affirms itself in the pages of thinkers and burns, solitary and magnificent, in some men who cannot be assimilated by the world around them."¹ It abides purely, invincibly and consciously only in a few spirits, who alone count historically.

Liberty always strives to re-establish and always does re-establish the social and political conditions of a more intense liberty. A world of liberty without obstacles, without threats and without oppressions is an infinite boredom. The anguish that men feel for the liberty that has been lost is not error or dream but a movement of moral conscience, it is history in the making.

If liberty is the basis of civilization, law is the basis of liberty. A law common to all without the distinction of race or opinion is the lowest rung of freedom. The belief in the supremacy of man over man is the legalism of the barbarian. The idea of arbitrary power exercised at the wilful discretion of any man is alien to the very conception of civilised society.

The state rests on no basis of mere law but on moral necessity. Its end is the promotion of material and spiritual welfare. The realisation of law is one of the proper means to this end. If

¹ Benedetto Croce, *History as the story of Liberty*, p. 61, 1941.

we base the state upon law and thus construe its origin as a legal process then the notion that the state-power is bound by true legal limitations, beyond which its governing power and the subjects' duty of obedience cease must be accepted. The antithesis that state and law exist by, for and under each other was solved by the means of distinction between Positive Law and Natural Law. This distinction was destined to be for centuries the focus of controversial literature.

According to the theorists of the middle ages Natural Law emanated from a principle transcending the state and it was the true and perfectly binding law. They supposed that before the state existed, the "*Lex naturalis*" already prevailed, and from this flowed those rules of law to which the state itself owed the possibility of a rightful establishment of its existence. In all the disputes as to the nature and extent of these limitations, men agreed that Positive Law, while it can never destroy the rules of Natural Law, yet can and must modify, develop, amplify and restrict these rules with regard to special cases.

In the middle ages the distinction was made between the purely ethical precepts which were regarded as self-evidently binding even on the supreme power, and the truly legal limitations which were drawn for this purpose. No one doubted that the Biblical text: "We shall obey God rather than men" (Act. v. 29), contains a valid rule of law for all times and all places, that the humblest of subjects would do right if he refused obedience to the command of the sovereign which was against God's will and his own conscience. The ever sharper opposition between these two concepts gave rise in the sixteenth century to two movements, one of which strove for the Legal State and the other for State-Absolutism. So far as Positive Law was concerned men adhered to the view that it was derived from the power of a human society and remained subject to it. All Positive Law was reduced to the concept of a statute.

A fiery polemic was carried against absolutism. Some would have the "*majestas personis*" absolutely exempt from all "*leges civiles*" with the exception of "*leges fundamentales*." Others put forward the view that the subject of "*majestas realis*" stands above all Positive Law and even above the law of the constitution. The pure doctrine of popular sovereignty raised the sovereign will of the people above the constitution itself.

Althusius defined a tyrant as the legitimately instituted ruler who breaks the law or neglects his duty. He is simply the public enemy whom any private person may seize and drive out. The exercise of this right, however, is granted to the public collectively. Private individuals have only the right of passive resistance and the natural right of self-defence in case of imminent peril.

The same stream of thought was turned against the doctrine of rights in the eighteenth century. Hobbes and his school believed in the material omnipotence of the sovereign, and hence denied all possibility of any established right of the subjects against the ruler or any established duty of the ruler towards the subjects. The doctrine of Pufendorf that as against the sovereign there may be true rights of the subjects gained favour.

The constitutional doctrine first restored the full legal character of the rights of subjects as against the state. Even the champions of the exclusive sovereignty of the ruler admitted the extensive rights of the peoples to annul and resist the unlawful acts of the ruler and even to depose a tyrant, without conceding the self-established right of resistance of subjects against the state. Grotius himself recognised in case of extreme tyranny a necessary right of revolution. Hobbes was the only theorist who endeavoured to set aside the principle that we should obey God rather than men and that every subject is empowered and bound to disobey a sinful command.

The idea of Natural Law was supplanted in the nineteenth century by the ideas of historical school of law. The law was singly conceived as the positive expression of an organic group-consciousness. To this school the ideas of Natural Law were but the empty fabric of a dream. As Gierke says "We no longer ask whether the state was prior to law or law was prior to the state; for as they are equally original, their seeds were planted with mankind itself; in their development they have grown in and through each other as potencies of that group-life which is inseparable from the idea of man."¹

Law is not the common will that something shall be, but the common conviction that something is. Law, whether manifested directly in usage or declared by a social organ appointed for this purpose, is the conviction of the human society that in it

there are external rules for the will, that is, limitations of freedom which are externally binding and by hypothesis enforceable. The state as the law-giver not only acts to a great extent as that which bears and determines the legal consciousness, but also completes the formation of all law with its command enforcement. Among all its functions the legal purpose is the state, just because its full realisation is possible only through the supreme might.

There is a mightless right and rightless might. But at the same time it is the source of that feeling and repairing power which evermore makes for the union of right and might. The crowd of journeymen and apprentices who built the structure of political science had one thing in common: the intensity of their sense of right equalled by their zeal for liberty.

Morally disturbed souls admire violence and men of violent temperament. Mistaking force for violence they bestow on them the character and prestige which appertain to force. The Stendhalian hero, the really energetic mind, who is found among the guests of the gaol, is often admired. Poets like D'Annunzio, who poured out the floods of their image-laden eloquence on such a character failed to differentiate between creative violence and criminality. Croce rightly points out that violence is not force but weakness and cannot even create anything whatever. Strength, on the contrary, is a synthesis of the will and is always constructive. It rises to its greatest expression in moral freedom.

Force is liberty or prepares for liberty while violence works negatively for liberty, by exciting liberty's opposite. Sanctions of war or states of siege should be regarded only as events of liberty in her recovery and development. Croce observes "Those states which think that they cannot rule and endure otherwise than by mortifying the intellect and oppressing the wills of men, reducing them to instruments; and because men cannot stoop to be instruments so long as they are completely men, the men become automata, who, instead of thinking genuine thoughts, repeat the words of a catechism and instead of performing follow prescription."¹

The Catholic theocracy in its political periods was an arsenal of expedients and tricks and was later on imitated by the

¹ Benedetto Croce, *History as the story of Liberty*, p. 286, 1941.

totalitarian states.¹ "Totalitarian" does not mean total harmonious co-operation, but of comprehensive and total subjection. The Church transports the sons of men to Heaven, to beatitude, but damaged in intellect and weakened in will-power. The totalitarian states to sustain their domination unwisely adopt the methods of the Church, which deny the fullness and strength of life. In that contradiction lies their condemnation.

Croce, with his deep historical insight says "At every breath of greater liberty lively intellects and alert minds awake and rush to labour." Violence is not productive. It is a fallacy to say that it has the virtue of refreshing and renewing the world by sweeping away old institutions, ideas, customs and old men. By this standard fire and earthquake can be reckoned productive. The attribute of productiveness belongs not to the fire or earthquake but to untiring human labour. Croce explains the idea, whose logical consequence is ignored by crass ignorance of men that even when violence supervenes to place itself by the side of justice it does not increase but disturbs or diminishes the effect of justice.

The altar erected to violence must be thrown down and we must restore and renew in our time the altar of reason. The reason and reasoning that were denied in the past were but reasoning upon mere abstractions, incapable of touching the fringe of reality. Reason has no concrete form of existence other than interpretation of experience and of documents. Outside that there remains only fanatic aestheticism or empty mysticism. Impulse, spontaneity and instinct in their valid aspects are but the effective development of the practical and moral life, practical and moral rationality. As Goethe said "There is an impulse, therefore there is a duty."

It is said that science as such recognises no such values unless it be sheer survival value. Man, though originally a product of the blind struggle for existence, has developed a morality, which assures him that kindness is no less a part of his birth-right than is reliance on tooth and claw. Thus, it is a matter for education, backed by ethical politics, to strive for mutual toleration. If certain prejudices are overcome individuals can achieve a working harmony.²

The German propagandist accepts the logic of Hitler's grim Herrenvolk doctrine. The Tory tiger defends its far-flung

1 Benedetto Croce, *History as the story of Liberty*, p. 237, 1941.

2 See Gunnar Dhalberg, *Race, Reason and Rubbish*, 1942; Ruth Benedict, *Race and Racism*, 1942.

possessions against the claims of simple human justice. The inevitable consequence of such policies is that the combatants are buying the bones of youth like flint in the soil of Europe.

Mr. Middleton Murry argues that British intolerance and selfish nursing of the spoils of victory bred Hitlerism. Germany was left smarting under a punitive peace. Hitler is the devil's "lackey" and his system "a satanic colossus." Therefore, "in so far as Britain is defending herself against Germany she is defending Christianity; but in so far as she is actually aiding Russia, she is aiding paganism." The moral cause of Britain is compromised by the Russian alliance.

The toga of Mr. Murry produces a variety of rabbits from its folds. The contradictions of Mr. Murry do not worry him, it is his reader that should resort to the asperin. He rejects the Gospel according to St. Marx and substitutes his alchemy, Christocracy.¹ He advocates a decentralised "truly co-operative society." Christocracy is something "sub-Christian." Since true Christianity is impracticable by man in his present state, Professor Murry pleads for a provisional "working attitude."

With his customary poetical persuasiveness he says "Alas, I sometimes feel that if the issue could be squarely put to the majority of my countrymen, and I were to stand before them like the Roman ambassador of old with peace and war in the folds of my toga—the peace of social justice, or the war necessary to avoid it—they still would choose the war."

There are two movements today purporting to offer to the world a universal principle which supersedes war: Christianity and Communism. The religious feeling helps the individual to cohere as a society. It develops a sense of common values and thereby promotes the unity between peoples. But it is an extravagant hope to say that a return to Christianity is a solution to our problems. The Christian spirit can exert a controlling influence on modern developments by means of fresh insight, and new thoughts which it now totally lacks.² The task is to reinterpret Christianity.

Professor Gilbert Murry contends that the ethical values which proceed from Buddhism and Christianity are equally a guarantee against the mechanical tyranny into which Socialism

¹ Middleton Murry, *Christocracy*, 1942; "Religion, Universal and Particular, *The Aryan Path*, October, 1942.

² J. H. Oldham, *Christianity and the Race Problem*, p. 125.

unspiritualised must degenerate. In the West, Christianity remains a nominal religion, but the effective religion is the various religions of social solidarity. In Russia and Germany the pretence has ceased. And that is at least more honest.

He takes pains to show that the individual regeneration which is essential to Christianity has for its outcome the entire renunciation of war. If a man became Christian he renounced war. This plain and incontrovertible truth was accepted and taught by the early Christian Church for the first three centuries of its existence. This great human movement was based on the instinct of maternal love. But subsequently the essential Christian doctrine of the regeneration of the individual into a man of peace and love, the brother of all men, was perverted into the quite different faith that men were saved, and thus guaranteed a happy existence after death, by the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus upon the Cross. Evangelical truth was obscured by gnosis, or the doctrine of esoteric mysteries. Choked with symbols and rites it lost all its spirituality. Men were regenerated not by their struggle towards the new and revolutionary understanding of the nature and love of God, which Jesus taught, but by the magical application of Baptism at birth.

Deep seated in the spiritual nature of man is the desire for religion. But no Semitic religion can withstand the fierce onslaughts of science. Christianity is not based on spirituality but on magic. Judaism and Islam are built on a system of ethics and not metaphysics. The future belongs to the impersonal absolute religion and it will not endure the disjunction between ethics and metaphysics. Therefore, in the end, personal religions will fade out from the common consciousness and thereby cease to be a force. It is absurd to say that a religion based on the absolute philosophy negates ethical activity. Buddhism is at once an ethical activity and a humane philosophy. Science deals with ponderables. It can never aspire to reach the heights of imponderables. It is the privilege of philosophy.

The end of moral activity is not obedience to commandments imposed by a personal God and to seek the end in mortification of the will to life. The object of morals is to promote life. Life is promoted by all forms of spiritual activity with their works of truth, beauty and practical unity. Good works in their concrete form are works of beauty, truth and usefulness. Morality to be effective must turn into passion and will and

utility. In morality Croce finds with the eye of genius myriad qualities: "it thinks with the philosopher, it shapes things with the artist, it labours with the farmer and the workman, it generates sons, it operates politics and wars, and it uses the arm and the sword. It will be a vicious circle in which morality is defined as intention and intention as morality."

Morality is nothing less than struggle against evil; and if evil did not exist, morality would have no reason to exist either. Evil is the continual undermining of the unity of life and therefore of spiritual liberty. Good is the continual re-establishment and assurance of unity and therefore of liberty. Evil is not a tempting seductive devil extraneous to life but it is to be found in life itself.

Every organism has a tendency to disorganisation. Health is the balancing of that which is out of balance. Every effort unless reined and confined will destroy the unity of the spirit and the spirit itself will perish. The kind of action which demarcates the boundaries of each separate activity and thus prevents the disintegration of spiritual unity and guarantees liberty, is the kind which faces and combats evil in all its forms and gradations: it is called moral activity. In one sense moral activity lacks any field of action and in another sense operates in all the fields.

The historical memory sustains and sweetens mankind in labour and in pain. Therefore, any New Moral Order should preserve the tradition of civilization. A revolution which is estranged from the epochs of history and of civilization will prove a moral blight. We cannot conceive of liberty without some social organisation nor can we conceive of a society without liberty. The New Order must guarantee the greatest freedom in the closest conformity with given conditions, and the best economic and social arrangements in the given conditions. Then only it can capture the heart of the "little man."

Communism treats the individual not as man but as subject material, and makes of society not a living organism but a mechanism. The logic of things does not allow communism to give birth to an ethical-political arrangement. Gandhism is something above and not opposed to communism. If man aspires to attain to the eternal founts of the Spirit, communism is an impediment. The support and instrument of communism is

the utility of its economic provisions. We can observe denials, aversion and scorn being levelled against both communism and Gandhism. Such critics delight in deceptive debating points. Gandhism will purge from communism the dross of its materialism and let the fundamental value shine forth. It is this intrinsic and pregnant signification : a movement towards worldly life will merge itself into another movement which is a hymn of joy to spiritual beauty. Gandhianizing Soviet Communism will give it a character, spiritual power and fruitfulness which it now lacks. It will be the modern humanism, and adequate to modern times.

The mind of such a prophet, turned inward rather than outward, is averse from pure speculation. His ideas show at all points the workings of an ardent character. To him the aim of politics is to devise the best means of instituting and conserving the human society. It is his great triumph to realise and make plain that the moral climate of a country can be altered only by immense and unanimous sacrifice of the self. In this respect, he has renewed and redefined, for all the peoples of the world, the message of their prophets and sages, forgotten or betrayed. To be applied to politics non-violence requires the development of a type of men full of infectious energy, love and a passion for organisation.

The secret of non-violent life, according to Gandhi, is "to observe perfect chastity, adopt poverty, follow truth and cultivate fearlessness." The first feature in the psychology of this type of character is to experience feelings of love for the people who hate him. The feelings of anger and love coexist and develop side by side in one of the many contradictions of our heart. The individual should not permit himself to do as prompted by the evil impulses. The unspoken but suppressed voice of the soul is more important than the one which actually speaks.

The second feature of the psychology of the truly non-violent character is that he should show the legitimacy of his feelings in action. Such types should strive to overcome the violence of war by corporate moral resistance. Moral rearmament will be possible only if an International Peace Brigade takes the place of an International police Force. The unity of states and

peoples will be real only so long as it is spiritual. A unity forced by mere events can only be a unity of extrinsic coincidence, not resolved into intrinsic relations. Gandhi by pleading for a world union based on non-violence has suggested a very intimate and profound vision of the peaceful development of world life.

10. INDIA AND A CO-OPERATIVE WORLD COMMONWEALTH

(1)

A draft Constitution

for a

Co-operative World Commonwealth

The world peoples and their states united in every sphere and inspired by a common determination to create a Co-operative World Commonwealth of liberty and justice, to serve definitive peace, to enlarge the sentiment of patriotism and to further social progress have given themselves this constitution. In furtherance of this object they bind themselves legally to the observance of the Charter of Fundamental Rights and Fundamental Duties of Citizens.

SECTION I.

The Commonwealth : Its Structure and Functions.

ARTICLE 1.

The Co-operative World Commonwealth is a federation of ten Supra-National Unions.

Its constitutional power proceeds from the peoples of the world.

ARTICLE 2.

The territory of the Commonwealth consists of the territories of the supra-national areas incorporated in the Commonwealth by the Enabling Acts passed by the Supra-National Legislatures desiring union.

ARTICLE 3.

The Constitution of the Commonwealth is bi-cameral. The lower house of the Commonwealth Assembly is composed of 500 deputies of the world peoples. The upper house or the

Commonwealth Council shall be formed in order to represent the Supra-National Representative Bodies in the legislation and administration of the Commonwealth. Its strength shall not exceed 50 members.

ARTICLE 4.

The Deputies shall be elected by universal, equal, direct, and secret suffrage by those of either sex and twenty years of age, on the principle of proportional representation.

Each supra-national area shall be divided into fifty equal electoral districts cutting across the state boundaries.

The voters in an electoral district shall elect one Deputy to the Commonwealth Assembly.

ARTICLE 5.

The Supra-National Legislatures at their joint session shall elect five delegates to the Commonwealth Council.

It is to be clearly noted that all the ten Supra-National Unions have equal rights, equal status and equal powers irrespective of either their nationality or money-power, in all their constitutional arrangements with the Commonwealth.

ARTICLE 6.

The Commonwealth Legislatures have exclusive power of legislation on the following subjects :

1. Inter-statal or Inter-Supra-National Relations.
2. Nationality, emigration and immigration.
3. Commonwealth defence.
4. Currency.
5. Tariffs.
6. Transport.
7. Posts and Telegraphs including Telephones.
8. Radio.
9. Propaganda.

ARTICLE 7.

The Legislatures have power of legislation on the following subjects :

1. Citizenship
2. The Judicial Procedure.
3. The Press, the right of association, the right of meeting.

4. Population questions, care of motherhood, infants, children, and young persons.
5. Public Health.
6. The right to work, insurance, protection of workers and employees and employment exchange.
7. The creation of Commonwealth University and a Commonwealth Encyclopaedia.
8. The care of discharged soldiers and their dependents.
9. The right of expropriation.
10. Socialization of natural resources and of economic undertakings, further the manufacture, production, distribution and pricing of economic commodities destined for public use.
11. The Commercial code, weights and measures, the issue of paper, money, banking and stock exchange regulations.
12. Transactions in foodstuffs and food luxuries.
13. Industry and Mining.
14. Insurance.
15. Merchant shipping, fishing, etc.
16. Railways, canal traffic, motor traffic by land, sea and air.
17. General Social Services.

ARTICLE 8.

A certain proportion of national and supra-national incomes shall be set apart for Commonwealth purposes, which shall include the maintenance of Commonwealth police force, air force, army and navy, cultural chambers, social services, etc. These revenues shall be the first charge on the supra-national and state revenues.

ARTICLE 9.

As long as and in so far as, the World Commonwealth Legislatures fail to make use of their rights of legislation, the Supra-National Governments retain their own rights of legislating on subjects mentioned in Article. 7.

ARTICLE 10.

Acts of the Commonwealth shall prevail over Acts of the Supra-National Unions.

ARTICLE 11.

The Commonwealth Government has the right of supervision in those matters on which it has the right of legislation. It

is entitled to send commissioners to the authorities of the Supra-National Unions, and with their concurrence to subordinate authorities of the States, in order to supervise the execution of the Commonwealth Acts.

ARTICLE 12.

Every Supra-National Union must have a federal constitution. The Representative Bodies of each Union must be chosen by universal, equal, direct and secret suffrage by all nationals of both sexes, on the system of proportional representation.

ARTICLE 13.

The merging of the States into a Supra-National Union shall serve the highest economic and cultural progress of the States, while paying all possible regard to the wishes of the population affected.

ARTICLE 14.

Should a constitutional dispute arise within a Supra-National Union, for deciding which there is no competent court, or should a dispute of a public nature arise between Unions and between the Commonwealth and the Union, either of the disputing parties may appeal to the Supreme Commonwealth Court of Judicature. The execution of the decision of the Supreme Commonwealth Court shall lie with the President of the Commonwealth.

ARTICLE 15.

The Commonwealth Legislatures should set up with minimum delay the following Commissions :

1. The Commonwealth Cultural Planning Commission.
2. The Commonwealth Social Planning Commission.
3. The Commonwealth Economic Planning Commission.
4. The Commonwealth Political Planning Commission.
5. The Commonwealth Transport Commission.
6. The Commonwealth Defence Commission.

ARTICLE 16.

No two years should pass without at least one session of the Assembly and Council and on the written requisition of at least 50 members, the President is empowered to summon extraordinary sessions.

ARTICLE 17.

The Assembly and Council shall be chosen for five and seven years respectively. New elections must take place at least within hundred days after the expiration of the term of office. The Legislature must hold their first meeting at latest on the sixtieth day after election.

ARTICLE 18.

The Commonwealth legislators are entitled to free passes on Commonwealth railways or airplanes or steam-ships.

ARTICLE 19.

The Legislatures shall constitute expert commissions referred to in Article 15 and undertake to respect their advice and recommendations as far as possible.

The Legislatures shall create a permanent Central Civil Service to carry on the business of the Commonwealth Government.

ARTICLE 20.

A resolution of the Legislature requires a simple majority of votes.

The Constitution may be legislatively amended. The constitutional amendments are only valid if two-thirds of the votes of members are secured in the legislature, after determining by means of a popular plebiscite, the consent of a majority of voters.

ARTICLE 21.

The Commonwealth forms a single government for tariffs and commerce and is surrounded by a uniform tariff frontier.

ARTICLE 22.

The President of the Commonwealth, the Chancellor and 15 Ministers shall be elected at a joint session of the Commonwealth Legislatures.

ARTICLE 23.

The President, the Ministers and the Legislators shall swear the following oath on taking office :

"I swear that I will devote my powers to the good of the Commonwealth peoples, that I will advance the public interests, will avert injury from it, will maintain the Constitution and the laws, will fulfil my duties conscientiously, and will exercise justice towards all."

ARTICLE 24.

The office of President is tenable for seven years. A President is re-eligible.

ARTICLE 25.

The President of the Commonwealth cannot hold a seat either in the Assembly or Council during his tenure of office as President.

ARTICLE 26.

The supreme command over the whole of the Commonwealth Defence Forces lies with the President.

ARTICLE 27.

1. Should any Supra-National Union or State fail to fulfil the obligations imposed on it by the Supra-National Constitution or the Supra-National Laws, the President of the Commonwealth may hold it to such obligations by means of armed force.
2. Should public order and safety be seriously disturbed or threatened within the national frontiers, the President may take necessary measures to restore public order and safety; in case of need he may use armed force and when a grievance is communicated to him he shall swiftly act.

The President is bound without delay whatsoever to communicate to the Commonwealth Legislatures all measures taken by him in virtue of clause 1 or 2 of this Article. The Legislatures may require such measures to be abrogated.

Further regulations will be laid down by an Act of the Commonwealth.

ARTICLE 28.

The Commonwealth Government consists of the Chancellor and the Commonwealth Ministers.

ARTICLE 29.

Chancellor and Commonwealth Ministers require the confidence of the Legislatures. Any one of them must resign should the Legislatures pass an express resolution withdrawing their confidence.

ARTICLE 30.

The Chancellor is Chairman of the Commonwealth Government. The Chancellor lays down the general policy and bears the responsibility therefor in the Legislatures.

Each Commonwealth Minister shall carry on his Department independently within the lines laid down by the Commonwealth policy, and shall bear individual responsibility therefor to the Legislatures.

ARTICLE 31.

The Commonwealth Ministers are bound to submit for discussion and resolution to the Commonwealth Cabinet all proposed legislation.

The Commonwealth Cabinet shall pass its resolutions by a simple majority.

ARTICLE 32.

The Commonwealth Legislatures at a joint session are entitled to impeach the Chancellor and the Commonwealth Ministers, on the plea that they have knowingly violated the Commonwealth Constitution or a Commonwealth law.

ARTICLE 33.

Proposed Bills shall be introduced by the Commonwealth Government, or from the body of either House.

ARTICLE 34.

Commonwealth laws, unless their text includes regulations to the contrary, shall come into force on the seventh day after the day of the publication of the Law Gazette in the Capital of the Commonwealth.

ARTICLE 36.

A Commonwealth law shall set up a Supreme Court of Judicature for the Co-operative World Commonwealth.

Judges are independent and subject to the law only.

ARTICLE 37.

The moral judicature shall be administered through the Court of the Commonwealth.

ARTICLE 38.

Legislative Acts shall regulate the obligatory setting up of administrative courts in the Commonwealth Supra-National Unions for the protection of the individuals against decrees and ordinances of the administrative authorities.

ARTICLE 39.

Until the Peace Brigades are constituted and organised on a Commonwealth basis, until the world conscience is mobilised

and until all the states of the world are brought into association within the Commonwealth in covenants of justice, law and fair-dealing, a world army, navy, police and air force should be maintained by the World Commonwealth Government.

SECTION II.

SUPRA-NATIONAL UNIONS.

ARTICLE 40.

It is essential for a better ordering of the world that ten Supra-National Unions comprising the federating units mentioned in the following table, shall be formed as an integral part of the Commonwealth.

I. THE CHINESE UNION.

Supra-National Units.	Area. (English Square miles)	Population.	Revenue	Race Composition.
1. China ...	2,908,475	422,707,868	87,969,685 d.	Mongoloid, Leiotrichus, Mesaticephalic & Zanzuoderms.
2. Japanese Empire ...	260,770	97,697,555	10,282,000,000 Yen.	
3. Mongolia ...	1,875,000	850,000		
4. French Indo China...	286,000	23,853,500	10,282,000,000 P.	
5. Manchukuo ...	503,013	36,948,972	570,000,000 Y.	
6. Tibet— ...	463,200	800,000		
Total ...	6,291,458	582,858,895	21,221,969,685	

II. THE INDIAN UNION.

1. India ...	1,805,332	388,800,000		Caucasian, Mediterranean & Melanesian.
2. Burma ...	2,62,732	13,212,192		
3. Ceylon ...	25,000	5,312,548		
4. Malay Peninsula ...	54,000	4,200,000		
5. Sumatra ...	8000,	8,000,000		
6. Borneo ...	31,106	2,57,804		
7. Java ...	50,777	41,200,000		
8. Philippine islands (7,000 islands) ...	114,400	7,685,426		
9. Siam ...	195,000	11,000,000		
10. Afghanistan ...	246,000	12,000,000		
Total ...	982,115	169,117,970		

III. THE MIDDLE EASTERN UNION.

1. Turkey ...	294,416	16,158,018	261,110,000 £	Hametic, Caucasian and Mediterranean.
2. Iran ...	628,000	15,000,000		
3. Iraq ...	116,600	3,560,456		
4. Arabia ...	1,000,000	7,000,000		
5. Syria ...	58,000	3,500,000		
6. Palestine. ...	9,000	1,250,000		
Total ...	2,106,016	43,468,474		

IV. THE RUSSIAN UNION.

U. S. S. R. ...	8,095,728	165,847,100	155,600 m. rubles.	Eur-Asiatic, Brachycephals & Mongoloids.
-----------------	-----------	-------------	-----------------------	------------------------------------------------

V. THE WESTERN EUROPEAN UNION.

Supra-National Units.	Area (English Square miles).	Population.	Revenue.	Race Composition.
1. Germany ...	583,418	79,576,758		Nordic and Mediterranean.
2. France ...	212,659	41,884,923	79,961,183,112 F.	
3. Italy ...	119,764	42,998,602	29,002 m. Lire.	
4. Spain ...	196,607	25,240,971	4,421,000,000 P.	
5. Sweden ...	173,841	6,810,214	1,692,850,000 Kr.	
6. Switzerland ...	15,944	4,066,400	518,200,000 F.	
7. Netherlands ...	12,712	8,728,569	770,008,000 G.	
8. Norway ...	214,556	2,814,194	790,256 K.	
9. Belgium ...	11,775	8,092,004	11,348,082,000 F.	
10. Finland ...	134,557	3,667,067	5,109,594	
11. Denmark ...	16,575	3,706,849	511,114,480 Kr.	
12. Ireland ...	26,592	8,000,000		
Total ...				

VI. THE CENTRAL EUROPEAN UNION.

1. Poland ...	150,051	32,106,400	2,523 m.Z.	Eur-Asiatic and Armenoid-Alpines.
2. Hungary ...	85,875	9,106,232	2,568,194,000 P.	
3. Yugoslavia ...	95,576	13,984,088		
4. Czechoslovakia ...	38,189	9,807,096	8,191,600,000 C.	
5. Rumania ...	113,884	19,933,802	82,228,194,000 C.	
6. Lithuania ...	72,959	2,879,074		
7. Estonia ...	18,353	1,126,418	105,878,000 K.	
8. Latvia ...	20,056	1,994,506	198,852,000 L.	
9. Greece ...	50,147	6,249,684	14,014,821,680 d.	
10. Albania ...	10,629	1,003,124	40,000,000 F.	
Total ...	605,722	98,095,389		

VII. THE ANGLO-SAXON UNION.

1. The United States ...	3,685,382	122,775,046	5,669,890,000 D.	Nordic and Iberian.
2. Canada ...	3,694,868	10,876,786	490,000,000	
3. Great Britain ...	89,014	44,937,444	1,049,188,698 L.	
4. Australia ...	2,974,581	6,929,691	95,064,790 L.	
5. New Zealand ...	103,722	1,491,484	36,872,046 £	
Total ...	10,547,562	186,410,451		

VIII. THE LATIN AMERICAN UNION.

1. Argentine ...	1,079,965	12,958,217	922,719,000 P	Palco-Amer-Indian, and Iberian.
2. Brazil ...	3,275,510	46,115,825	4,209,417 C	
3. Chile ...	296,717	4,287,445	1,682,000,000 P.	
4. Cuba ...	44,164	4,227,578	76,000,000 P	
5. Uruguay ...	72,153	2,098,331	91,220,000 G	
6. Paraguay ...	61,647	954,848	10,783,862 G	
7. Peru ...	482,258	2,699,106	174,701,894 S	
8. Mexico ...	763,944	16,552,722	442,000,000 P	
9. Ecuador ...	275,986	3,200,000		
10. Guatemala ...	45,452	2,004,900	10,332,650 Q	
11. Haiti ...	10,204	3,000,000	5,837,800 G	
12. Honduras ...	44,275	962,685	11,026,178 L	
13. Falkland Islands ...	4,618	2,378	70,553	
14. Newfoundland ...	42,734	67,720	11,381,700 L	
15. Guiana ...	89,480	294,800	1,268,519 L	
16. Bahamas ...	4,404	85,162	411,764	
17. Leeward Islands ...	422	13,934,088	337,547 £	
18. Venezuela ...	95,576	1,581,348		
19. Dominion Republic ...	19,325	1,172,334	11,594,920	
20. Nicaragua ...	60,000	8,701,816		
21. Colombia ...	439,997	585,077		
Total ...	7,209,459	118,978,285		

IX. THE NORTH AMERICAN UNION.

Supra-National Units.	Area (English Square miles).	Population.	Revenue	Race Composition.
1. Anglo-Egyptian Sudan ...	969,600	6,342,477	4,857,784 £	Mediterranean and Hametic.
2. Egypt ...	13,574	15,904,525	40,594,800 £	
3. Tunisia ...	48,300	2,608,318	811,198,000	
4. Algeria ...	847,500	7,234,684		
5. Sahara ...	1,815,718	79,576,758		
6. F. Somaliland ...	8,492	44,240		
7. Libya ...	679,358	888,401	660,115,000 L.	
8. Liberia ...	43,000	1,500,000	2,242,000 d.	
9. Ethiopia ...	350,000	12,000,000	2,183,000,000 L.	
10. Nigeria ...	372,599	20,568,840	5,811,088 £	
11. Gambia ...	89	14,370	166,744 £	
12. Gold Coast ...	91,848	3,700,267	5,185,595 £	
13. Sierra Leone ...	2,500	104,655	886,144 £	
14. Morocco ...	167,220	16,552,722	442,000,000 P	
Total ...	5,409,778	167,060,252		

X. THE SOUTH AFRICAN UNION.

1. The Union of South Africa ...	472,550	10,160,000	48,610,741 £	Negrito, Mediterranean, Nordics, Bastards.
2. Tanganyika ...	360,000	5,022,640	2,161,598 £	
3. B. Cameroons ...	34,081	857,675	100,249 L.	
4. Basutoland ...	11,716	562,411	421,123 £	
5. Bechuanaland ...	275,000	265,000	281,748 K	
6. S. Rhodesia ...	150,538	55,408	3,676,000 £	
7. N. Rhodesia ...		1,370,000	1,464,744 £	
8. Belgian Congo ...	902,082	10,304,084	11,433,032,000 F	
9. Madagascar ...	241,094	3,797,936	56,773,000 F	
Total ...	2,546,855	32,395,154		

SECTION III.

FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL DUTIES OF CITIZENS.

(a) THE INDIVIDUAL.

ARTICLE 41.

Equality of rights of citizens of the Commonwealth irrespective of their sex, nationality or race in all spheres of economic, political or social life is an indefeasible law.

ARTICLE 42.

Any direct or indirect restriction of the rights of citizens as well as any advocacy of racial or national exclusiveness or hatred and contempt, is punishable by law.

ARTICLE 43.

All citizens of the Commonwealth have the right of free movement throughout its whole territory.

Every citizen is entitled to emigrate from one Supra-National Union to another. Emigration may not be restricted except in virtue of a Commonwealth law.

ARTICLE 44.

Liberty of person is inviolable.

Persons who are deprived of their liberty must at least be informed on the following day what authority has ordered such deprivation of liberty and on what account it has made such order; they must have immediate opportunity of lodging objections against such deprivation of liberty.

ARTICLE 45.

Every citizen has complete control over his house, which is inviolable. Exceptions are only admissible when the law so provides.

ARTICLE 46.

Every citizen is entitled to express his opinion in word, writing, print, pictorially, or by any other means, within the limits imposed by the law.

Legislative action is further admissible for the suppression of obscene or indecent literature, as well as for the protection of young persons at public performances or exhibitions.

(b) THE LIFE OF THE COMMUNITY

ARTICLE 47.

The State and the municipalities shall undertake to perfect and purify on a social basis the purity of family life. Prolific families are entitled to the protection and care of the state.

ARTICLE 48.

Marriage rests on the equality of the two sexes.

As marriage is the foundation of the family life it shall be under the special protection of the Constitution.

ARTICLE 49.

Legislation shall provide for illegitimate children the same opportunities for physical, spiritual and social development as are provided for legitimate children.

ARTICLE 50.

Young persons shall be protected against exploitation and against moral, spiritual and physical neglect.

ARTICLE 51.

All citizens are entitled to meet together peacefully and unarmed, without previous notice or special permission.

ARTICLE 52.

Corporate rights may not be refused to any association on the ground that its aims are of a political, social-political, or religious nature.

ARTICLE 53.

Every citizen is entitled to address a written petition or complaint to the competent authority or to the peoples' representatives.

ARTICLE 54.

All nationals without exception, are eligible for public office in accordance with the law, and in proportion to their capacity and achievement.

All exceptional measures against women officials are abolished.

ARTICLE 55.

Every citizen is bound to give personal service on behalf of the State or the local authority in accordance with the law.

(c) RELIGION AND RELIGIOUS BODIES

ARTICLE 56.

There is no Commonwealth Church. All persons living in the Commonwealth enjoy entire liberty of faith and of conscience. The Constitution guarantees the undisturbed practice of religion, which is under the protection of the Commonwealth.

No person is bound to reveal his religious convictions except when a legally constituted statistical census makes such inquiry necessary.

(d) SCHOOLS AND EDUCATION

ARTICLE 57.

Associations, whose aim is to promote the cult of a common view of life, shall be on a par with religious associations.

ARTICLE 58.

Primary and High School education is universally compulsory.

Education and educational apparatus in elementary and high school are free of charge.

The Commonwealth shall provide facilities for the youth of all nations to reside and study among the residents of other nations irrespective of race, nationality or religion to promote a sense of world unity.

ARTICLE 59.

Public education shall be organically developed. The basis of the upward organization shall be the preparation for a variety of vocations; the basis of accepting a child in a certain school shall be its capacities and inclinations, and not the social or financial position of its parents or their religious beliefs.

Private property schools are abolished.

ARTICLE 60.

All schools shall aim at inculcating moral character, a sense of civic duty, personal and professional efficiency in the spirit of Commonwealth solidarity and of the reconciliation of peoples.

(e) THE ECONOMIC SYSTEM

ARTICLE 61.

The economic system must be so arranged that social justice shall be maintained and that all men shall have the Right to Work and the Right to Leisure after work.

ARTICLE 62.

Freedom of trade and of manufacture shall be guaranteed on the basis of the Commonwealth law.

ARTICLE 63.

A basic minimum amount of property is guaranteed by the Constitution. Expropriation can only be undertaken in the common interest and on the basis of a law.

Adequate compensation shall be paid.

ARTICLE 64.

Distribution and cultivation of the soil shall be supervised by the State or Supra-National Governments as to ensure that no abuses take place, and that efforts are made to secure a healthy lodging for every citizen and suitable homes for each family.

The owner of the soil is bound to cultivate and make use of his land, in the common interest. Increase of value arising without any expenditure of work or of capital shall be utilised for the common good.

ARTICLE 65.

The right of inheritance shall be guaranteed in accordance with the Civil Code. The laws shall determine the proportion of inherited property accruing to the state.

ARTICLE 66.

The Commonwealth shall be entitled by legal enactment, without prejudice to the payment of compensation, to transfer to public ownership private enterprises suitable for socialization.

ARTICLE 67.

Distributive and productive co-operative societies and their federations shall be incorporated in the public economic system.

ARTICLE 68.

The Commonwealth shall create a comprehensive system of insurance with a view to the maintenance of health and of efficiency, to the protection of motherhood, to providing the economic consequences of old age, infirmity and change of circumstances.

ARTICLE 69.

The Commonwealth shall secure to the workers a uniform minimum of social rights.

ARTICLE 70

Workers, employers and consumers shall be represented in the Commonwealth Economic Planning Commission, in order to carry out their economic functions and to co-operate in putting the socialization laws into force.

(2)

The political theory should endeavour to set up a definite scheme descriptive of the articulation of mankind.

The political philosophy of the middle ages borrowed from Aristotle the definition of the state as the highest and the most perfect community, a community that is self-sufficient in contrast to the lower grades represented in family and commune. Before the close of that period the idea of the state was completely concentrated and the attribute of external sovereignty became the essential and the distinctive mark of the state. The concentration of state-life at a single point did not imply the concentration of all community life at a single point. The drift

of theory set steadily toward the exaltation of the exclusive sovereignty of the state.

After the sixteenth century the centralizing and atomistic trends grew more intensive. By way of contrast to the Medieval World-Monarchy the idea of the Society of States was constituted. The concept meant only natural obligations of a social kind. As against the Society of Nations the concept of sovereignty was worked out precluding all possibility of a state composed of states.¹ The problem whether the exclusive sovereignty of the unitary state was compatible with a separate and independent communal life of the partial societies was sharply debated.

The conception of state power was one of absorptive Omnipotence so that the power of the other societies could be conceived only as an effluence from the state. The notion of the State-of-States first set up by Besold was later developed by Hugo in a more precise manner. Pufendorf attacked it with the weapon of the strict theory of sovereignty. He recognised only the "Personal Union" and the pure confederation as the normal form of the association of states. Hert argued for the full validation of a mediate category, construed as a federal state, between the articulated unitary state and the confederation of states.

The concept of sovereignty was weakened after the middle of the eighteenth century and the doctrine of division of powers gained in influence. Thus the path was cleared for the advancement of the idea of the federal state. First produced by Althusius on a basis of Natural Law the federal idea now entered on its modern process.

The absolutists declared that the idea of the state within the state was incompatible with the very idea of sovereignty. Tugo claimed for the state the right to dissolve every "corps particulier," and asserted openly that between the sacred natural right of the individual and the sovereignty of the civil society embodied in the state there was no room for a special right of the lesser societies to exist. Rousseau rejected every "association partielle" as a disruption and perversion of the general will.

In the German School of Natural Law there prevailed a tendency to construct the social body from the bottom upward,

¹ See S. Brie, *Der Bundesstaat*. Part I, 1874, p. 14.

to set up every community having material or local limitation as a society already self-created, and to introduce the state for the first time as the dome arching over all. While Montesquieu championed the corporative mediate groups, Moser based the state upon the autonomous and independent organization of all spheres of social life. Humboldt who voiced the inmost feelings of the "Nature-Right" school emphasised on free association as against the centralizing atomistic trend.

Federalism both as a theory and technique is based on the principles of relativity and empiricism. In its political mechanism it provides for the creation of pluralistic political organisation.¹ The philosophical argument of federalism is based on the highest possible utility. Pluralism or the doctrine of oneness in manyness means "things are with one another in many ways but nothing includes everything, or dominates over everything."² The notion of pragmatic plurality which emphasises that the individual is not only himself but also the state, is the basic spirit of federalism. Otto Von Gierke called the pluralistic conception "unity in plurality." Territorial representation as prevailing in the American system provides the unique feature of unity in plurality.³

If sovereignty is regarded as the essential characteristic of the state then no federal state can ever reach the stage of pluralistic conception. Preuss called sovereignty "territorial supremacy," Laski "legal imperative" and Carl Schmitt "deciding the exceptional condition." A state should be formed as the German theorists say from the bottom upward not from the top downward. Then the state theory should be independent of the idea of sovereignty.

Unless the supremacy of the individual state in the modern community is restricted no plan for world order can be real or lasting. Karl Marx's theory of the state in its philosophical basis is unitaristic. The dictatorship of the proletariat is opposed to the federal evolutionary idea. But the ultimate aim of humanity must point to unity in plurality.

The federal structure must be built on the foundation of historical actuality, from the bottom to the top. All human organisations must be integrated in the perfect form of inter-depen-

¹ See William James, *Pragmatism*, 1922, pp. 56, 57.

² William James, *Pluralistic Universe*, p. 322.

³ See Charles A. Beard, "Some Aspects of Regional Planning" in the *American Political Science Review*, May, 1926.

dence. A synthesis of personal and community values should be the cardinal point of the new system. Then law should be regarded as a necessary stage towards ethics.

Federation without socialism would be the capitalist's paradise. The capitalist structure is organised for expansion. Without an agonising revolution it cannot return to a non-aggressive structure. Therefore, any plan for a supra-national federation or a hierarchy of unions must be combined with socialism. Otherwise it will lead to a unified capitalist dictatorship.

In Soviet Russia for the first time in recorded history the whole economic life of the population is creatively planned for social advancement. The means of production is taken away from an economic oligarchy and is exercised by a party devoted to social justice.

It was federal particularism and not federal organisation that brought about the decay of Germany's parliamentary system. The first requisite of German political stability is a return to federalism based on the modern socialistic basis. The ideal state of the future must recognise and respect the pre-eminence of international law.

The national state should subordinate itself to some kind of effective superior government, deriving its authority not from the national states but from the individual citizens of the whole union. The historical events of the near future will determine the geographical area the union should comprise and the method by which it should be founded. Nevertheless, in a real democratic federal union the member states must renounce the notion of absolute legal sovereignty and the right to manufacture armaments. Distribution of state authority between the collective state and individual states cannot be defined without regard to time and place. Decentralized legislation under the guidance of the central legislature must replace the hitherto orthodox method of the distribution of the powers by the Constitution.

The federal union must aim at the maintenance of the political autonomy of each member. In the interests of its own security the union cannot ignore the internal affairs of the member states. This involves the diminution of the right of self-determination of the member states. Such a state of flux must inevitably lead to disputes which require decision.

The world federation must be a spiritual collectivity. Its mechanism must be a living unity not of two parts but of two forces, itself being their heteronomous bond.¹ In such a system individual states are not objects of integration but means of integration. The synthesis of socialism and federal state organisation leads to a unique and independent type of state organisation, the federal state with federal homogeneity. As the Co-operative World Commonwealth is the state of the future a balance must be struck between the socialist scheme of collectivity and the natural basis of pluralistic individuality.

In the light of the theories put forward by the leading thinkers, whose share was never slight in that process of federal thought, we have ventured to formulate a Draft Constitution of a Co-operative World Commonwealth. The present war has knocked through the partition walls between the nations and the continents. If we are deliberately planning in favour of a peaceful order, an order which will give stability to progress and will remove wasteful friction, these functions can only be adequately fulfilled by a Commonwealth. The only force that binds individuals together is cordiality, and by the same token, the only structure that binds nations together is a Commonwealth.

An abstract philosophic theory of the state will fail to respond to the vital needs of the time. A system which attempts to hold the different peoples together under the coercion of force and the guidance of intrigue will be found wanting. Therefore, the Commonwealth we visualise is a union of wills. Its Constitution is a Constitution of peace. It is not a straight-jacket but is elastic. It is a practical document and the conscience of the world is being mobilised to express itself in some such way.

It is the general experience of history that a federal system cannot work successfully unless it is based on equality of status and function. This Commonwealth government must be a government of power. A Statutory Convention or Congress should be summoned by the organisers of the Peace Conference to consider and adopt a plan to establish Supra-National States. For the first time two thousand five hundred million people will emerge as a world collectivity, represented in the Statutory

¹ See Otto Von Gierke, *Die Genossenschaftslehre*, p. 562.

Das deutsche Genossenschaftsrecht, vol. II, p. 42; Vol. III, pp. 186-664.

The cardinal point of Gierke's system is "the final goal by which we measure the ethical justification of both general and individual purposes, is the harmonious agreement of both. This harmony must be on the synthesis of personal and community values or in other words of individual and social ethics."

Congress to draft a world constitution. It will be a grim tragedy if its great promise should disappear unfulfilled. The Constitution will be worthy of any and every proposed sacrifice as it is a definite guarantee of a peaceful and stable world order.

The framers of the Constitution should not hold their meetings in secret. A commission for the delimitation of electoral divisions should be appointed. Electoral divisions should be made by dividing the total number of voters in the supra-national areas by number of members in the supra-national Assembly to be returned, in such a manner as that each division should contain as nearly as would be possible the same number of voters. The Commissioners should give consideration to :

1. Community or diversity of interests,
2. Means of communication, and
3. Sparsity or density of population.

The Supra-National State should be constituted out of existing states taking into consideration as far as possible geographical contiguity, racial unity, cultural heritage and economic and social structure. A corner-stone of this state mechanism will be the security of the absolute freedom of trade between the different parts. Otherwise it will be exposed to the floods of a tariff war. With a patriotism resting on locality, not on race and with economic considerations strongly supporting such a policy, it will be no wonder if the Supra-National Union should gain the day against state particularism. Says Brand "Institutions once set up, have a way of striking root."

Under a federal system there cannot obviously be that complete sovereignty of the Parliament, which is characteristic of the British system. The principle that federal laws must depend for their execution upon federal agents should commend itself to the framers of the constitution. As regards the Second Chambers deference should be paid to the principle of state representation. If the intention is to give effect to the federal idea then election to the lower house should be based on the principle of equal state representation. The sharpest attacks will come from the quarter of the advocates of state rights. With regard to methods of preventing a deadlock between the two houses the device of a joint sitting may be employed.

It is only the compelling force of necessity, the recognition of the fact that without a Supra-National Union men should live

under an eternal nightmare, which should persuade the 56 factions called nations to accept the Constitution imposed on them by the wisdom of its framers and the trends of the period. What is necessary is a federation of peoples, not of states. The states should unite to form a new entity with powers in some matters exclusive of those of the states, in others covering the same ground, but paramount in case of conflict, but in many other spheres not infringing state autonomy. The change should not be a mere addition of a new entity to existing bodies, it should be the creation of a new whole; which embraces the parts and in the process alters and changes their nature. In this respect the American Constitution, which was conceived in a prescientific epoch gives little direct guidance.

Any federal compact will inevitably result in disintegration if the harmonious co-operation of the peoples is not allowed free play to its application. The hitherto insoluble problem of the clash of colours will be solved by impartiality and the giving of equality of opportunity to all the races. The framers should seek not a mere legislative union but a federal solution. The federal solution is desirable not only on grounds of political expediency but it will meet the moral and intellectual aspirations of the human race. Its main value should be not in the system, but in the function.

The Supra-National Union should reveal itself as a federal state, on the model of the Soviet Union, with an entire disregard of sovereignty. The federal union movement should be substantially to amalgamate states into several Supra-National Unions and the latter creating a Co-operative World Commonwealth for distinctly definite and limited objects. It should be the widely visible sign of a new and creative world will.¹

¹ The British Federal Union recently asked a number of British leaders for their views on World federation. Mr. Bernard Shaw said :

"World federation is far beyond the political capacity of the human race at present.

"The British Commonwealth could not hold its American colonies and now cannot hold India. It has secured nothing better than neutrality even from Eire in the present war ; and it is doubtful whether in a general federal reorganisation Australia would not federate with the United States. World federation being out of the question, there must be federal units, fairly homogenous psychologically ; and this makes it fairly certain that the nuclei of the Asiatic federations must be oriental and not 'far flung' from the West. The western democracies, as they are called, are still intensively Tory, and as far as they are not narrowly insular are rabidly imperialistic.

"By all means let us work towards federalism ; but the job will be a tough one. Its simplicity is a dangerous delusion."

Professor Julian Huxley said :

"Our actions during the war will largely determine the course of events during the period of relief and reconstruction, and this in its turn the character of the subsequent period of peace. I am in full agreement as to the desirability of a Political Warfare Board, and its importance for post-war developments.

"I would point out that Federation is not the only method which could be employed to guard against German rearmament, e.g., there are transnational organisations of European heavy industry,

The problem will be to bring the national racial divisions in harmony with that unity which political and economic developments have made necessary. The Supra-National Union must be inspired with the spirit of the state and the state must be inspired with the ideal of the Supra-National Union.

THE STRUCTURE OF A CO-OPERATIVE WORLD COMMONWEALTH

1. THE LEGISLATURE

The Commonwealth Assembly.
The Commonwealth Council.

2. THE EXECUTIVE

The President
(The Commonwealth Cabinet).
The Chancellor.
15 Ministers.

3. THE JUDICIARY

The Supreme Court of Judicature.

4. THE EXPERT BODIES

1. The Commonwealth Cultural Planning Commission.
2. The Commonwealth Social Planning Commission.
3. The Commonwealth Economic Planning Commission.
4. The Commonwealth Political Planning Commission.
5. The Commonwealth Transport Commission.
6. The Commonwealth Defence Commission.

5. THE SUPRA-NATIONAL UNIONS¹

1. The Chinese Union.
2. The Indian Union.

an international security organisation with adequate inspecting powers, etc. The Colonial problem to my mind is sufficiently important to demand a "Colonial Charter" to itself."

Professor Gilbert Murry said:

"Apart from the almost insoluble problem of the distribution of voting power, it is hard to imagine that any strong independent nation would consent to take some course of action of which it bitterly disapproved in obedience to a majority—or even a two-thirds majority—in an International Assembly of whose members very few could enter into its own national feelings and interests, while a certain number might even be actuated by ill-will. An international Assembly very likely decreed that Australia or even the United States must completely change their immigration laws; but would they obey? An International Assembly might be persuaded that Eire had a right to its national unity and that Northern Ireland must no longer be kept artificially united to England. Would England agree to drive Northern Ireland out, or would Northern Ireland agree to go? Yet both these questions belong to the sphere of international politics.

"The framers of the Covenant were driven back on a system which I still think the most effective and practicable. It is called the Rule of Unanimity, but the phrase is misleading. It really is a series of definite agreed obligations, but beyond those agreements national freedom. In any future reshaping of the international authority this system might well be continued, but made more effective in certain ways. First the military provisions of the Covenant should be made more precise, as they were in the Geneva Protocol, and should include the organisation of definite precautionary action beforehand for the prevention of war, for instance, by the control of oil and metals; secondly, economic agreements of a very far-reaching character will clearly be necessary if the Atlantic Charter and other Anglo-American projects are to be put into operation; Thirdly, there should be an agreed provision for the enforcement of international law, on which the Permanent Court of International Justice should have the deciding voice."

¹ The Supra-National Unions should be constituted out of existing states taking into consideration as far as possible geographical contiguity, racial unity, cultural heritage and economic and social structure.

3. The Russian Union.
4. The Middle Eastern Union.
5. The Western European Union.
6. The Central European Union.
7. The Anglo-Saxon Union.
8. The Latin-American Union.
9. The North African Union.
10. The South African Union.

(8)

We have certainly no illusions about the immediate realization of "A New World Order." As probability is the guide of life, we need not wait for a working faith till every item of progress that we hope to find in the reconstructed world is firmly established beyond the possibility of dispute. We should live by so much of truth as has been revealed to us by the study of history, and, "step forth upon the path where the light shines."

The commonest cause for the breakdown of civilizations is militarism. Caesarism in its aggressive form precipitates conflict between co-ordinated states. Geographical expansion which is the outcome of such a conflict destroys the entire social fabric. The expansion force is therefore a social disease. The extreme wickedness and the manifold miseries of the world can be mitigated by erecting a structure based not on antagonism of interests but on community of interests. Viewed in this light the Co-operative World Commonwealth will be an automatic and infallible forcing process of social and moral growth.

The release of uncontrolled sources of individual production and lethal weapons has thrown this world into a welter of conflict. If science is not divorced from ethics then it can assist in the establishment of a more rational and harmonious world order.¹

Improvement in technique is not a criterion of social growth. It is a sign of arrested civilization. Science has no doubt given man command over physical environment. But the machine is a talisman of exploitation, not of culture. It is the chasm between science and human values that accounts for the unsatisfactory present.

¹ See H. A. L. Fisher, (ed) *Background and Issues of the War*, 1940.
G. Growther, *Ways and Means of War*, 1940.
Sir George Young, *Federalism and Freedom*, 1941.
Sir Alfred Zimmern, *Spiritual Values and World Affairs*. 1939.
The Deeper Causes of the War, A Symposium, 1940.

Social action does not spring from the society alone but from self-articulation also. Therefore, a New Social Order must be ever responsive to the call of that freedom which is individual and regulated. Positive individuality is not an easy escape from limitations but a willing acceptance of obligations.

The concept of freedom must be considered on the sociological, political and the metaphysical levels. Freedom as a social force must extend the bases of a living love and understanding. Freedom as a political acquisition will be a safe guide only if the individual knows that freedom confers rights as well as freedom enforces duties. Freedom as a metaphysical doctrine must help man to become aware of his inner light and to live by its glory. There is a "faith in faith" and the new faith must be a faith in the awareness of this relation and true meaning of freedom.¹

The Freudian autopsies might not interest the average man. Still the fact remains that the basic instincts are capable of perversion and sublimation. By the proper employment of the social discipline according to the duties and rights prescribed for the classes in society and the stages of individual life, the primary instincts can be sublimated to the four objects of life or ends of man.

The conception of a New Social Order demands a combination of aesthetic and ethical judgment. For, the surest and the subtlest test of a civilization is not industrialism and democracy but the aesthetically beautiful and the morally inspiring. As opposed to the totalitarian way of life the Hindu scheme of life is democratic and just. Life becomes vapid and empty if social indifference is substituted for social responsibilities. Therefore, the social planners were concerned with the relation between the society and the individual. They were aware that the strength of a social system is the individual's ability of response to a spiritual ideal aided by social drill.

Whether it was a mere coincidence, or whether these manifestations were connected is a bold question. The Hindu social planners believed that *Dharma* gave coherence and direction to the different activities of life. It was not a religious creed or cult imposing an ethical or social rule. It was a complete rule of life, harmony of the whole man. Hierarchy was not coercion but a law of Nature.

¹ See *Freedom: Its Meaning*. By various Authors.
Planned and Edited by Ruth Nanda Anshen, 1942.
M. C. D'Arey, *Death and Life*, 1942.

THE INDIVIDUAL DUAL AND THE SOCIETY

Purusharta (Objects of Life)	Varna Dharma class (Duties and Rights)	Asrama Dharma according to Guna and Karma (Life- stages).	Perversions	Basic Instincts
Moksha (Spiritual)	Brahmana (Planners of the Social Order)	Sanyasi (The Philosopher)	Lack of Moral Authority, Atheism: Nihilism.	Fear.
Kama (Emotional)	Kshatriya (Preservers and Enforcers of the ethical way)	Vanaprastha (The Guardian)	Militarism, Imperialism, etc.	Sex.
Artha (Economic)	Vaisya (Executors)	Grihastha (The Worker)	Commercial Exploitation, Capitalism, Materialism.	Food.
Dharma (Ethical)	Sudra Workers	Brahmachari (The Student)	Social and Intellectual Drudges.	Lethargy.

The Basic Instincts are capable of perversions. But by proper employment of the Social Discipline to the Duties and Rights prescribed for the classes in society and the stages of individual life the primary instincts can be sublimated to the four objects of life or Ends of Man.

We cannot accept the views of the critics of this system uncritically. In particular, Dr. Bhagavandas's¹ attitude is that the Hindu social system was based on the fundamental division of men in accordance with their vocational aptitudes. It was sound economic and sociological basis. The change from vocational aptitude to heredity brought about disunity and the loss of high ideals. Therefore, he advocates "root out this sinful Castism and replace it by the four-fold vocational scheme." Dr. Bhagvandas endeavours to make partial truth serve as the whole truth.

The biological laws of heredity operate equally effectively in building up a Social Order and therefore a healthy race is necessary though its importance may be exaggerated for political ends. It is a biological fact that can no longer be gainsaid that physical conditions like inheritable diseases as well as state aptitudes—intellectual (the Huxleys and the Darwins) and anti-social (the criminal records of certain families) form an indispensable part of the social structure.

A New Social Order will therefore be evolved by a conscious process emphasizing both heredity and environment, rejecting alarmist fantasies of the Brave New World of Aldous Huxley, and give free scope to the development of individuality.

(4)

The New World Order must preserve the social and political equilibrium and eliminate the events which disturb it. But the historical forces create ever new equilibriums. Therefore, every action in the true New Order must be both preservation and revolution, preservation which is the starting-point for revolution. Individuals and super-organisms must unite these two moments within themselves. The pure preservation of equilibrium calls for specialists and institutions of a federal nature.

After examining the copious and mechanical schemes of estimable thinkers like H. G. Wells, H. J. Laski, G. D. H. Cole, Otto Strasser, Lionel Curtis, Benes, Clarence Streit, G. W. Keeton, C. B. Purdom, Leonard Woolf, William Beveridge, Barbara Ward and "Balbus" and the official schemes for reconstruction like the Nazi New Order, the Asiatic Co-prosperity Scheme, the Communist International and the Atlantic Charter, it is sad and even displeasing to formulate the conclusion that all these schemes show the inherent defect of basing any world order on

¹ See Bhagavan Das, *World War and Its Only Cure: World Order and World Religion*, 1942.

the perpetuation of political and social inequalities. Race prejudice, capitalist interests, a false sense of religious values and a desire to perpetuate vested interests have consciously or unconsciously influenced these theories. These preferences are in fact desires, needs and may be illusions from which new forms of institutions and new errors will emerge.

The boast of originality made by some of these thinkers is buttressed by ignorance of history and they suppose that the New Order is waiting for the elect. H. G. Wells refers to his fellow-inhabitants as a "clotted mass of two thousand million obdurate, irrational human beings" and affirms that the Revolution must "deflect the whole rout into a new way of living and keep it there."¹ On the other hand, Gandhi, the apostle of the moral life knows and understands his times, the maturity of his times, and from that intimate knowledge his activity is born. He knows it is an elusive fear that a knowledge of the past takes the spirit out of new things. The truth is that the more energetically the past is known, the more energetic is the stimulus to go beyond it. This knowledge is life, and life invites further life.

According to Salvador de Madariaga,² there are three ways of keeping the masses at peace: by fooling them, by coercing them or by satisfying them. The first seeks to conquer the emotion and the second subjugates the will of man. Only the third seeks peace by conquering the mind. Peace is an outward manifestation of the inward virtue of the community. It cannot be attained by outward mechanical operations such as "enforcement" or by slogans or by the "hypnotic words of lion tamers."

His discovery of the self constitutes a man's progress in life. Individual culture means the awareness of man of the unity of his own individuality and of the relationship of this unity, to the rest of the universe. Man feels or guesses this unity. The awareness of this feeling or guess of a unity brings him a knowledge, a possession, an intellectual harmony. This effort is the inmost essence of the final goal of progress; of culture in the individual; progress of science in the relation of natural facts. Progress must be understood as the gradual development of the awareness of unity in mankind. Says Gandhi "My consolation and my happiness are to be found in service of all that lives, because the Divine essence is the sum total of all life."

¹ H. G. Wells, *Phoeniz*, 1942.

² See Salvador de Madariaga, *The World Design*, 1939.

Underlying our social affairs there is a scheme of Natural Law. It is composed of laws at once analogous to those of the physical order and justifying and proving the rightness of moral judgment, now no longer a matter of pious aspirations or speculative insight, but the product of the complete mystic in the laboratory of social life.¹ In the empirical as well as the ethical approach of Gandhi it has reached its summits, wherein the concept of the political man is the subject of an ethical power.

The history of the human race is largely the history of the effort to reconcile selfishness with co-operation. The elimination of the war-system is the final and the most difficult phase of this age-long effort. Neither the ethical nor the political solution has been developed to operate with full vigour in the universal field. Religion has lost its force to become a vehicle for universalizing the ethical solution. John Foster Dulles² assigns to religion a purely individualist end when he says that individual acts of unselfishness cannot be projected far beyond the range of personal associations. Gandhi believes that the State should never be above ethics and that the absence or deficiency of ethical purpose in political life leads to an impoverishment, to an inclination of inactivity, to a cowed acceptance of tyranny. He observes "religion not in the conventional but in the broader sense helps me to have a glimpse of the Divine essence. This glimpse is impossible without full development of the moral sense. Hence, religion and morality are for me, synonymous terms."

(5)

Gandhi has found the meaning of life in the will to live an optimistic and ethical life. He has made the pure reason and a living mysticism to withdraw from their peak of ideas and sterile contemplation, meet half-way, embrace each other, and mingle into a new spiritual personality. It is right to take account of its deep significance. We are more frequently accustomed to say that thought stops at the frontiers of mysticism. In truth, the intellect and will are reconciled in reason. When will has thought out its relation to intellect, it leads to a living mysticism.

Gandhi aspires to bridle the tumult of passion and lessen the dangers of unreflectiveness and prepare for the acceptance of true life and of its law, prepare men for definite and particular

¹ See George Catlin, *The story of Political Philosophers*, 1939.

² See John Foster Dulles, *Peace and Change*, 1939.

duties. As the age gets its ideas from personalities who produce a World-View we must therefore know the historical influence or limitations of the Gandhian concepts. His World-View has spiritual power as it is a product of a synthesis of intellect and feeling. It is valid for all times because it is based on universal thought alone. He maintains that ethical progress is the essence of civilization and that civilization depends upon the worthiness of individual members. Therefore, new organizations must give rise to this new spirit. To create a New World Order on new lines implies that we should become new men ourselves.

The twin ideals of Gandhi are that life should be a true repose and that action should be without the torment of passion. This cannot be called contradictory and absurd, since it is not merely a logical affirmation but a spiritual aspiration. Call it a dream—a dream of blessedness, still it has the power of rendering the dross pure, the disturbed serene, the “dream” a dream with eyes open. It is a passion illuminated by the light of truth upon the background of the infinite.

The western thinkers have failed to formulate a definite World-View because they have construed it as the “activist” instincts and impulses. Moreover, they have overlooked the fact that if the mass prevails over the individual it is decay.

The collapse of western civilization at the end of the nineteenth century was chiefly due to the breakdown in the mutual co-operation and understanding between ethical ideals and reality. The ethical and optimistic theories of the period were discarded along with the speculative rationalism on which they were grounded. Therefore, an ill-balanced unhealthy society emerged. This stigma of unhealthiness cannot be ascribed to the philosophy of Gandhi. It is an idyll of simple life and creative work, of sweet, neighbourly love, of peace animated through reason triumphing over the dispositions of man; of progress achieved through the individual striving for the inner perfection of his own personality, whence love is coloured with religion and religion with spiritual values.

Philosophy is defined as a process by which there comes to completion, step by step, and even with purer and clearer consciousness that conviction about the value of civilization, the universal validity of which it is the object of philosophy itself

to affirm. But it is not enough if philosophy enables one to convince oneself of the value of general thought. Where other philosophies have lacked capacity to transform themselves into living philosophies of the people, it is precisely there that Gandhism has succeeded.

Civilization is progress: it is material and spiritual progress on the part of the individual as well as of the mass. It is lessening of the struggle of existence—"Man's assertion in Nature against Nature, among fellow-men and against them." In the preference between the material and the truly spiritual progress the ancient Indian conception should bloom again—that we should prefer the truly spiritual because it is working of spirit on spirit.

The western mechanical civilization has brought about psychical injury. Overstrain and the consequent idleness has become a physical necessity. Specialization has resulted in an imperfect development of the human personality. A social mentality which destroys humanity is created. Natural courtesy is replaced by a rigid code of manners based on indifference. The organised control of individual thought by government, by press and by moneyed classes has engendered spiritual poverty. The result is a lack of reflection on human conduct.

The completeness of the decadence of this civilization is marked by the resurgent nationalisms. The cult of blind patriotism as such is barbarism leading to purposeless wars. *Real Politik* has come to mean the setting up of certain territorial interests into dogma and their support by popular sentiment. Therefore, crude nationalism distorts the idea of civilizations and creates in turn national civilizations grounded on national peculiarities. The Gandhian solution for this malady is that national feeling should be placed under the guardianship of reason, morality and civilization.

Indian culture stands for certain definite eternal values epitomized in the word *Dharma*. Gandhi stands for these universal values irrespective of race or creed. His staunch belief that only a completely independent India can bring peace to the warring nations on the principles of truth and non-violence is the only solution as far as we can visualise. Both Gandhi and Nehru stand for a United Independent India and both are internationalists. They have two fairly similar minds and hearts, both having the same strength, but also the sweetness, the

rhythm and the passion of humanity, possessed as they are of mellowness and spontaneity. Gandhi is on a far higher plane but his schemes cannot be dismissed as unrealistic.

The great prophets and sages like Buddha, Christ and Confucious introduced order without rules and restrictions and made people believe in them without the help of dogmas. So supreme and majestic were their personalities that they are beyond the exigencies of time and space. The uniqueness of the mystic's direction lies in the identity of life and action. He will strive to bring about in the environment the mutation he has achieved in himself.

The soul of a mystic is absorbed into God but the will which is a part of the soul remains outside. Though the soul has felt God's presence yet action calls it back from God. In the complete mystic the union is entire and God acts through his soul. That is why a *Maha-Atman* is not lost in mystical ecstasy but returns to the field of action. Christ went into wilderness, Buddha forgot his self in penance and Gandhi withdrew himself into his *Ashrama*. But when the urge came they returned for uplifting the masses.

Their conception of a New World Order is based on the fundamental spiritual unity of all mankind. Under the inspiration of such prophets the history of the future sets out essentiality to be the history of a political activity lending reality and firmness to the characters of individuals. Then only all the troubled judgments arising out of the passions and errors of man will be corrected. Then only nationalisms and sovereignties will disappear and the conflict between rights and duties will be resolved in achievement, purity and holiness. This is embodied in Gandhism.

APPENDIX A

Fourteen Points of Wilson

(Address to the Congress, January 8, 1918)

The first five Points in which President Wilson laid down his principles are given below :—

1. Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind, but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view.
2. Absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas, outside territorial waters, alike in peace and in war, except as the seas may be closed in whole or in part by international action for the enforcement of international covenants.
3. The removal, so far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of the equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance.
4. Adequate guarantees given and taken that national armaments will be reduced to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety.
5. A free, open-minded, and absolutely impartial adjustment of all colonial claims based upon a strict observance of the principle that in determining all such questions of sovereignty the interests of the population concerned must have equal weight with the equitable claims of the government whose title is to be maintained.

The Four Principles Of Peace

(Address to the Congress, January 18, 1918).

1. First, that each part of the final settlement must be based upon the essential question of that particular case and upon such adjustments as are most likely to bring a peace that will be permanent.
2. Second, that peoples and provinces are not to be bartered about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were mere chattels and pawns in a game now for ever discredited, of the balance of power; but that
3. Third, every territorial settlement involved in this war must be made in the interest and for the benefit of the popu-

lation concerned, and not as a part of any mere adjustment or compromise of claims among rival states; and

4. Fourth, that all well-defined national aspirations shall be accorded to the utmost satisfaction that can be accorded them without introducing new or perpetuating old elements of discord and antagonism that would be likely in time to break the peace of Europe and consequently of the world.

APPENDIX B

The Covenant Of The League Of Nations

(Summary of the most important clauses)

The High Contracting Parties,

In order to promote international co-operation and to achieve international peace and security

by the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war,

by the prescription of open, just and honourable relations between nations,

by the firm establishment of the understandings of international law as the actual rule of conduct among Governments, and

by the maintenance of justice and a scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations in the dealings of organised peoples with one another,

Agree to this Covenant of the League of Nations.

ARTICLE 1

The original Members of the League of Nations shall be those of the Signatories which are named in the Annex to this Covenant and also such of those other States named in the Annex as shall accede without reservation to this Covenant. Such accession shall be effected by a declaration deposited with the Secretariat within two months of the coming into force of the Covenant. Notice thereof shall be sent to all other Members of the League.

Any fully self-governing State, Dominion or Colony not named in the Annex may become a Member of the League if its admission is agreed to by two-thirds of the Assembly, provided that it shall give effective guarantees of its sincere intention to observe its international obligations, and shall accept such regulations as may be prescribed by the League in regard to its military, naval and air forces and armaments.

Any Member of the League may, after two years' notice of its intention so to do, withdraw from the League, provided that all its international obligations and all its obligations under this Covenant shall have been fulfilled at the time of its withdrawal.

ARTICLE 2

The action of the League under this Covenant shall be effected through the instrumentality of an Assembly and of a Council, with a permanent Secretariat.

ARTICLE 3

The Assembly shall consist of Representatives of the Members of the League.

The Assembly shall meet at stated intervals and from time to time as occasion may require at the Seat of the League or at such other place as may be decided upon.

The Assembly may deal at its meetings with any matter within the sphere of action of the League or affecting the peace of the world.

At meetings of the Assembly each Member of the League shall have one vote, and may have not more than three representatives.

ARTICLE 4

The Council shall consist of Representatives of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, together with Representatives of four other Members of the League. These four members of the League shall be selected by the Assembly from time to time in its discretion. Until the appointment of the Representatives of the four Members of the League first selected by the Assembly, Representatives of Belgium, Brazil, Spain and Greece shall be members of the Council.

With the approval of the majority of the Assembly, the Council may name additional Members of the League whose Representatives shall always be members of the Council; the Council with like approval may increase the number of Members of the League to be selected by the Assembly for representation on the Council.

The Council shall meet from time to time as occasion may require, and at least once a year, at the Seat of the League, or at such other place as may be decided upon.

The Council may deal at its meetings with any matter within the sphere of action of the League or affecting the peace of the world.

Any Member of the League not represented on the Council shall be invited to send a Representative to sit as a member at any meeting of the Council during the consideration of matters specially affecting the interests of that Member of the League.

At meetings of the Council, each Member of the League represented on the Council shall have one vote, and may have not more than one Representative.

ARTICLE 5

Except where otherwise expressly provided in this Covenant or by the terms of the present Treaty, decisions at any meeting of the Assembly or of the Council shall require the agreement of all the Members of the League represented at the meeting.

All members of procedure at meetings of the Assembly or of the Council, including the appointment of Committees to investigate particular matters, shall be regulated by the Assembly or by the Council and may be decided by a majority of the Members of the League, represented at the meeting.

The first meeting of the Assembly and the first meeting of the Council shall be summoned by the President of the United States of America.

ARTICLE 8

The Members of the League recognise that the maintenance of peace requires the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations.

The Council, taking account of the geographical situation and circumstances of each State, shall formulate plans for such reduction for the consideration and action of the several Governments.

Such plans shall be subject to reconsideration and revision at least every ten years.

After these plans shall have been adopted by the several Governments, the limits of armaments therein fixed shall not be exceeded without the concurrence of the Council.

The Members of the League agree that the manufacture by private enterprise of munitions and implements of war is open to grave objections. The Council shall advise how the evil effects attendant upon such manufacture can be prevented, due regard being had to the necessities of those Members of the League which are not able to manufacture the munitions and implements of war necessary for their safety.

The Members of the League undertake to interchange full and frank information as to the scale of their armaments, their military, naval and air programmes and the conditions of such of their industries as are adaptable to warlike purposes.

ARTICLE 10

The Members of the League undertake to respect and preserve as against aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all Members of the League. In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression the Council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

ARTICLE 11

Any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the Members of the League or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole League, and the League shall take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations. In case any such emergency should arise the Secretary General shall on the request of any Member of the League forthwith summon a meeting of the Council.

It is also declared to be the friendly right of each Member of the League to bring to the attention of the Assembly or of the Council any circumstances whatever affecting international relations which threatens to disturb international peace or the good understanding between nations upon which peace depends.

ARTICLE 12

The Members of the League agree that if there should arise between them any dispute likely to lead to a rupture, they will submit the matter either to arbitration or to inquiry by the Council, and they agree in no case to resort to war until three months after the award by the arbitrators or the report by the Council.

In any case under this Article the award of the arbitrators shall be made within a reasonable time, and the report of the Council shall be made within six months after the submission of the dispute.

ARTICLE 13

The Members of the League agree that whenever any dispute shall arise between them which they recognise to be suitable for submission to arbitration and which cannot be satisfactorily settled by diplomacy, they will submit the whole subject-matter to arbitration.

Disputes as to the interpretation of a treaty, as to any question of international law, as to the existence of any fact which if established would constitute a breach of any international obligation, or as to the extent and nature of the reparation to be made for any such breach, are declared to be among those which are generally suitable for submission to arbitration.

For the consideration of any such dispute the court of arbitration to which the case in referred shall be the court agreed on by the parties to the dispute or stipulated in any convention existing between them.

The Members of the League agree that they will carry out in full good faith any award that may be rendered, and that they will not resort to war against a Member of the League which complies therewith. In the event of any failure to carry out such an award, the Council shall propose what steps should be taken to give effect thereto.

ARTICLE 14

The Council shall formulate and submit to the Members of the League for adoption plans for the establishment of a Permanent Court of International Justice. The Court shall be competent to hear and determine any dispute of an international character which the parties thereto submit to it. The Court may also give an advisory opinion upon any dispute or question referred to it by the Council or by the Assembly.

ARTICLE 15

If there should arise between Members of the League any dispute likely to lead to a rupture, which is not submitted to arbitration in accordance with Article 13, the Members of the League agree that they will submit the matter to the Council. Any party to the dispute may effect such submission by giving notice of the existence of the dispute to the Secretary General, who will make all necessary arrangements for a full investigation and consideration thereof.

For this purpose the parties to the dispute will communicate to the Secretary General, as promptly, statements of their case, with all

the relevant facts and papers, and the Council may forthwith direct the publication thereof.

The Council shall endeavour to effect a settlement of the dispute, and if such efforts are successful, a statement shall be made public giving such facts and explanations regarding the dispute and the terms of settlement thereof as the Council may deem appropriate.

If the dispute is not thus settled, the Council either unanimously or by a majority vote shall make and publish a report containing a statement of the facts of the dispute and the recommendations which are deemed just and proper in regard thereto.

Any Member of the League represented on the Council may make a public statement of the facts of the dispute and of its conclusions regarding the same.

If a report by the Council is unanimously agreed to by the members thereof other than the Representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute, the Members of the League agree that they will not go to war with any party to the dispute which complies with the recommendations of the report.

If the Council fails to reach a report which is unanimously agreed to by the members thereof, other than the Representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute, the Members of the League reserve to themselves the right to take such action as they shall consider necessary for the maintenance of right and justice.

If the dispute between the parties is claimed by one of them, and if found by the Council, to arise out of a matter which by international law is solely within the domestic jurisdiction of that party, the Council shall so report, and shall make no recommendation as to its settlement.

The Council may in any case under this Article refer the dispute to the Assembly. The dispute shall be so referred at the request of either party to the dispute, provided that such request be made within fourteen days after the submission of the dispute to the Council.

In any case referred to the Assembly, all the provisions of this Article and of Article 12 relating to the action and powers of the Council shall apply to the action and powers of the Assembly, provided that a report made by the Assembly, if concurred in by the Representatives of those Members of the League represented on the Council and of a majority of the other Members of the League, exclusive in each case of the Representatives of the parties to the dispute, shall have the same force as a report by the Council concurred in by all the members thereof other than the Representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute.

ARTICLE 16

Should any Member of the League resort to war in disregard of its covenants under Articles 12, 13 or 15, it shall *ipso facto* be deemed to have committed an act of war against all other Members of the League, which hereby undertake immediately to subject it to the

severance of all trade or financial relations, the prohibition of all intercourse between their nationals and the nationals of the covenant-breaking State, and the prevention of all financial, commercial or personal intercourse between the nationals of the covenant-breaking State and the nationals of any other State, whether a Member of the League or not.

It shall be the duty of the Council in such case to recommend to the several Governments concerned what effective military, naval or air force the Members of the League shall severally contribute to the armed forces to be used to protect the covenants of the League.

The Members of the League agree, further, that they will mutually support one another in the financial and economic measures which are taken under this Article, in order to minimise the loss and inconvenience resulting from the above measures, and that they will mutually support one another in resisting any special measures aimed at one of their number by the covenant-breaking State, and that they will take the necessary steps to afford passage through their territory to the forces of any of the Members of the League which are co-operating to protect the covenants of the League.

Any Member of the League which has violated any covenant of the League may be declared to be no longer a Member of the League by a vote of the Council concurred in by the Representatives of all the other Members of the League represented thereon.

ARTICLE 17

In the event of a dispute between a Member of the League and a State which is not a Member of the League or between States not Members of the League, the State or States not Members of the League shall be invited to accept the obligations of Membership in the League for the purposes of such dispute, upon such conditions as the Council may deem just. If such invitation is accepted, the provisions of Articles 12 to 16 inclusive shall be applied with such modifications as may be deemed necessary by the Council.

Upon such invitation being given the Council shall immediately institute an inquiry into the circumstances of the dispute and recommend such action as may seem best and most effectual in the circumstances.

If a State so invited shall refuse to accept the obligations of membership in the League for the purposes of such dispute, and shall resort to war against a Member of the League, the Provisions of Article 16 shall be applicable as against the State taking such action.

If both parties to the dispute when so invited refuse to accept the obligations of membership in the League for the purposes of such dispute, the Council may take such measures and make such recommendations as will prevent hostilities and will result in the settlement of the dispute.

ARTICLE 18

Every treaty or international engagement entered into hereafter by any Member of the League shall be forthwith registered with the

Secretariat and shall as soon as possible be published by it. No such treaty or international engagement shall be binding until so registered.

ARTICLE 19

The Assembly may from time to time advise the reconsideration by Members of the League of treaties which have become inapplicable and the consideration of international conditions whose continuance might endanger the peace of the world.

ARTICLE 22

To those colonies and territories which as a consequence of the late war have ceased to be under the sovereignty of the States which formerly governed them and which are inhabited by peoples not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world, there should be applied the principle that the well-being and development of such peoples from a sacred trust of civilization and that securities for the performance of this trust should be embodied in this Covenant.

The best method of giving practical effect to this principle is that the tutelage of such peoples should be entrusted to advanced nations who, by reason of their resources, their experience or their geographical position can best undertake this responsibility, and who are willing to accept it, and that this tutelage should be exercised by them as Mandatories on behalf of the League.

The character of the mandate must differ according to the stage of the development of the people, the geographical situation of the territory, its economic conditions and other similar circumstances. Certain communities formerly belonging to the Turkish Empire have reached a stage of development where their existence as independent nations can be provisionally recognised subject to the rendering of administrative advice and assistance by a Mandatory until such time as they are able to stand alone. The wishes of those communities must be a principal consideration in the selection of the Mandatory.

Other peoples, especially those of Central Africa, are at such a stage that the Mandatory must be responsible for the administration of the territory under conditions which will guarantee freedom of conscience and religion, subject only to the maintenance of public order and morals, the prohibition of abuses such as the slave trade, the arms traffic and the liquor traffic, and the prevention of the establishment of fortifications or military and naval bases and of military training of the natives for other than police purposes and the defence of territory, and will also secure equal opportunities for the trade and commerce of other Members of the League.

There are territories, such as South-West Africa and certain of the South Pacific Islands, which, owing to the sparseness of their population, or their small size, or their remoteness from the centres of civilization, or their geographical contiguity to the territory of the Mandatory, and other circumstances, can be best administered under the laws of the Mandatory as integral portions of its territory, subject

to the safeguards above mentioned in the interests of the indigenous population.

In every case of mandate, the Mandatory shall render to the Council an annual report in reference to the territory committed to its charge.

The degree of authority, control, or administration to be exercised by the Mandatory shall, if not previously agreed upon by the Members of the League, be explicitly defined in each case by the Council.

A permanent Commission shall be constituted to receive and examine the annual reports of the Mandatories and to advise the Council on all matters relating to the observance of the Mandates.

ARTICLE 23

Subject to and in accordance with the provisions of international conventions existing or hereafter to be agreed upon, the Members of the League ;

- (a) will endeavour to secure and maintain fair and humane conditions of labour for men, women, and children both in their own countries and in all countries to which their commercial and industrial relations extend, and for that purpose will establish and maintain the necessary international organisations ;
- (b) undertake to secure just treatment of the native inhabitants of territories under their control ;
- (c) will entrust the League with the general supervision over the execution of agreements with regard to the traffic in women and children, and the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs ;
- (d) will entrust the League with the general supervision of the trade in arms and ammunition with the countries in which the control of this traffic is necessary in the common interest ;
- (e) will make provision to secure and maintain freedom of communications and of transit and equitable treatment for the commerce of all Members of the League. In this connection, the special necessities of the regions devastated during the war of 1914-1918 shall be borne in mind ;
- (f) will endeavour to take steps in matters of international concern for the prevention and control of disease.

ARTICLE 26

Amendments to this Covenant will take effect when ratified by the Members of the League whose Representatives compose the Council and by a majority of the Members of the League whose Representatives compose the Assembly.

No such amendment shall bind any Member of the League which signifies its dissent therefrom, but in that case it shall cease to be a Member of the League.

APPENDIX C

Atlantic Charter : August 14, 1941.

Text Of The Joint Declaration

The President of the United States and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing his Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future of the world.

First, their countries seek no aggrandisement, territorial or other.

Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.

Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of Government under which they will live ; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

Fourth, they will endeavour, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further enjoyment by all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.

Fifth, they desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field, with the object of securing for all, improved labour standards, economic advancement, and social security.

Sixth, after the final destruction of Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.

Seventh, such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance.

Eight, they believe all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

APPENDIX D

(*Hindu*, December 6, 1942)

FEDERAL UNION MOVEMENT

The English and American Manifestoes

The following is the full text of a manifesto recently issued by the Federal Union Movements in Britain and America :

"To win this war for good and all : Living as we do in a period of swift and violent transition, exceeding in opportunity and danger even the days of the American, English and French Revolutions and believing that Man holds within himself, through mind and soul, the power of growth and promise of development and that by co-operative effort he can and must extend the areas controlled by reason :

" We, Federal Unionists, propose action on the following parallel lines as a realistic programme to win this revolutionary war of the freedom, prosperity and peace of the common man :

" 1. We believe that we can best preserve and extend those basic freedoms which are the great heritage of Western civilization by forming *Now* behind the strongest possible Bill of Rights and within the framework of the broadest possible international organization, a Federal Union of those peoples with whom we have compelling natural ties, opposing imperialism in all its forms, and extending the pledge of statehood in this Union to all other peoples who are prepared to give the guarantees of individual freedom which all its members grant to one another, including in this pledge those people now under Axis distatorship who aid in the common victory by overthrowing their dictators.

" 2. We believe that the world imperatively needs an all-inclusive international organization in which the United States, the British Commonwealth, China, Russia, India and the other powers known as the United Nations should take the lead ; that this association should be organized immediately ; that it should be organized immediately ; that it should include in its membership as many countries as can be induce to join ; that it must be predicated upon a limitation of national sovereignty ; and that it should contain such elements of federalism as are found to be practicable."

* * * * *

Seventy-five prominent men and women, including authors, economists, trade unionists and church leaders, submitted to-day to

President Roosevelt and to Congress a "programme for the United Nations for the adoption of those fundamental economic principles which are necessary to insure a just and lasting peace."

The programme declares in part: "The American people recognise the need for the preservation of individual rights, of human dignity and freedom, for the flowering of culture and things of the spirit as the ultimate objects to strive for. We are convinced that such aims can only be attained if based on a sound workable economic policy which ties nations together and makes possible an interchange of vital national resources, goods, food, services and ideas and insures the full employment of labour and capital.

"The Atlantic Charter applies to all peoples everywhere—it commits the United States to uniting with other nations after the war, securing for all improved labour standards; economic adjustment and social security and—furthering the access, in equal terms, to the trade and raw materials of the world. The 'economic agreements' of the United States with other Allied nations under the terms of the national Lend-Lease Act point the way to joint post-war programme for the United Nations' economic effort in peace time. We recommend early consideration and approval by the people of the United States of an international economic union of all nations.

"We believe there should be no difference between the East and the West, the Atlantic and the Pacific, and that all peoples should be permitted and encouraged to govern themselves at the earliest possible time. We are opposed to imperialistic control on the part of anyone, either victor or vanquished.

"We are in favour of the surrender of so much sovereignty as will be necessary to create a world society which will be equitable and just and keep open the way to lasting peace."

The Hindu, December 11—1942.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acland, Richard. *Unser Kampf*, 1940.
What It Will be Like, 1942.
- Adams, W. G. S., ed. *The Deeper Causes of War : A Symposium :*
1940.
- Adler, A. *La temperament nerveux*, 1926.
- Amery, L. S. *India and Federation*, 1942.
- Angell, N. *The Future of the League of Nations*, 1936.
- Armstrong H. F. *We or They*, 1937.
- Arthur, H. *La Genese des Mythes*, 1938.
- "Balbus." *Reconstruction and Peace*, 1941.
- Baruch, B. *Taking the Profits Out of War*.
- Baudoin, Charles. "Obituary of Alfred Adler."
- Benedict, Ruth. *Race and Racism*, 1942.
- Bencs, Edward. "The Organization of Post-War Europe,"
Foreign Affairs, January 1942.
- Bentwitch, N. *The Colonial Problem and the Federal*
Solution, 1941.
- Beveridge, W. *Peace by Federation*, 1941.
- Blank, Herbert. *Schleicher?—Hitler? Cromwell?* 1932.
- Bonn, M. T. *The Crumbling of Europe*, 1939.
- Borkenau. *World Communism*, 1939.
- Borkenau, Franz. *Socialism, National or International*, 1942.
- Brailsford, H. N. *America Our Ally*, 1940.
- Brierly, J. L. *The Law of Nations ; An Introduction*
to the International Law of Peace, 1928.
- Brown, W. *War and Psychological conditions of Peace*,
1942.
- Bruck, V. D. *The Third Empire*, 1934.
- Caillois, Roger. *Le Mythe et l' Homme*, 1938.
- Carr, E. H. *The Twenty Years Crisis*, 1919-1939.
The Future of Nations, 1941.
Conditions of Peace, 1942.
- Cassel, Gustav. *The Downfall of the Gold Standard*, 1936.
- Catlin, George. *Anglo-Saxony and its Traditions*, 1939.
The Story of Political Philosophers, 1940.

- Chakotin, Serge. *The Rape of the Masses*, 1940.
- Channing—Pearce, ed. *Federal Union*, 1940.
- Churchill, W. *The World Crisis.*
My Early Life.
- Coates, Zelda & W. P. *From Czardom to Stalin Constitution*, 2nd ed., 1942.
- Coatman, John. *Magna Britannia*, 1986.
- Cobbon. *The Crisis of Civilization*, 1941.
- Cole, G. D. H. "Nazi Economics : How Do They Manage It"; *The Political Quarterly*, January—March, 1939.
Europe, Russia and The Future, 1941.
Victory Or Vested Interest? A Symposium, 1942.
- Collingwood, R. G. *The New Leviathan*, 1942.
- Croce, Benedetto. *History as the History of Liberty*, 1941.
- Crowther, G. *Ways and Means of War*, 1940.
- Crossman, R. H. S. *Plato Today*.
- Cuenot, L. *La Genesse especes animales*, 1911.
- Curtis, Lionel. *The Commonwealth of God*, 1938.
Decision, 1941.
Action, 1941.
- Dahlberg, G. *Race, Reason and Rubbish*, 1942.
- Dawson, C. *Beyond Politics*, 1939.
- Dennis, L. *The Dynamics of War and Revolution*.
- Dewey, John. *Freedom and Culture*, 1942.
- Drucker, P. *The End of Economic Man*.
- Dudley, K. *Kafir Socialism*.
- Durant, W. *On the Meaning of Life*, 1933.
- Durbin, E. F. M. *The Politics of Democratic Socialism*, 1940.
- Eastman, Max *Marxism, Is It Science ?* 1941.
Stalin's Russia and the Crisis in Socialism, 1941.
- Elton, Lord. *St. George or the Dragon : Towards a Christian Democracy*, 1942.
- Fabra-Luce, A. *Histoire secrete de le conciliation de Munich*, 1938.
- Figgis, N. J. *From Gerson to Grotius*, 1916.
- Finer, Herman. *Representative Government And A Parliament of Industry*, 1923.

- Fisher, H. A. L. *Background and Issues of the War: A Symposium*, 1940.
- Fisher, H. G. B. *The Clash of Progress and Security*.
- Forster, Arnold. "The Atlantic Charter," *The Political Quarterly*, June, 1942.
- Fosdick, Dorothy. *The New Freedom of the Seas*, 1942.
- Friedman, W. "Ethical Standard and Political Strategies," *The Political Quarterly*, June, 1942.
- Fritz, Lenz. *What is Wrong with International Law*, 1941.
- Frolov, V. P. "Why the Nordic Race is Going Backward?" *Den Nordiske Race*, 1928.
- Fuller, J. F. C. *Pavlov and His School*, 1938.
- Gayn, M. J. *Empire Unity and Defence*, 1934.
- Gessel, Silvio. *War and Western Civilization*, 1932.
- Gierke, Otto Von. *Fight for the Pacific*, 1941.
- Goldenweiser, A. C. *The Natural Economic Order*, 1929.
- Gregg, R. B. Development of Political Theory, 1939.
- Gregory, J. W. Political Theories of the Middle Ages, 1920.
- Halevy, E. *das deutsche Genossenschafts recht*, Vols. 3, *Die Genossenschafts theories*.
- Haldane, J. B. S. *Early Civilization*.
- Hankins, F. H. *A Discipline for Non-Violence*, 1941.
- Hearnshaw. *The Menace of Colour*, 1925.
- Heilperin, M. A. *The World Crisis*, 1914-18.
- Hesse, Kurt. *Marxist Philosophy and the Sciences*.
- Hillquilt, M. *The Racial Basis of Civilization*, 1926.
- Hobson, S. G. *A Survey of Socialism*, 1928.
- Hook, Sidney. *International Monetary Economics*, 1939.
- Horney, K. *Der Feldherr Psychologos: A Search for the Leader of the German Future*, 1922.
- Hunter, Robert. *From Marx to Lenin*, 1921.
- Ishihara, K. *Pilgrim to the Left*, 1939.
- Ishimaru, T. *Towards the Understanding of Karl Marx*, 1938.
- Joad, C. E. M. *Psychoanalysis*, 1939.
- Japan at the Turning Point, 1940.
- Japan Must Fight Britain, 1936.
- For Civilization, 1940.
- What is at Stake? Why not sa
- Journey Through the War Min
- The Philosophy of Federalism,¹

- Jung, C. G. *Psychological Types.*
- Keeton, G. W. *The Case for an International University, 1941.*
 "Anglo-American Co-operation," *The Political Quarterly*, October-December, 1941.
- Keith, A. B. *Causes of the War, 1942.*
 "The Evolution of the Human Races." *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, Vol. LVIII, 1928.
- Keynes, J. M. *The Economic Consequences of the Peace.*
- Kleeck, Mary. *On Economic Planning, 1925.*
Federation: Its Nature and Conditions, 1942.
- Korsch, Karl. *Revolutionare Commune, 1930.*
- Kranold, Hermann. *The International Distribution of Raw Materials, 1938.*
- Krishnamurti, Y. G. *Indian States and the Federal Plan, 1939.*
Constituent Assembly and Indian Federation, 1940.
Jawaharlal Nehru: The Man and His Ideas, 1941.
- Kruppskaya, N. *Memories of Lenin.*
- Kucyysnki, R. "Living-Space and Population Problems, 1939.
- Lenin. *Was Tun*, translated under the title "What is to be Done?"
Lenin's Collected Works, 30 Vols., Marx-Lenin-Engles Institute, Moscow.
- Lenin & Zinoviev. *Gegen dem Strom, 1921.*
- Levy, P. M. G. "Psycho-Sociology and Political Propaganda: The German Experience."
Revue de l'Institut de Sociologie, Vol. XIII, 1938.
- Lippmann. *The Good Society.*
- Lothian, Marquis of. *Pacifism is not Enough, 1941.*
- Lugard, L. *Federation and the Colonies, 1941.*
- Macartney. *National States and National Minorities.*
- Macmillan, Harold. *The Middle Way, 1938.*
- Macmillan, W. M. *Democratise the Empire, 1941.*
- Madariaga, S. de. *The World's Design, 1938.*
- Magistretti, W. "Japan's New Order in the Pacific,"
Pacific Affairs, June 1942.
- Matsuo, K. *How Japan Plans to Win, 1942.*

- McDougall, W. *World Chaos*, 1981.
National Welfare and National Decay.
- McGovern, W. M. *From Luther to Hitler: The History of Nazi Political Philosophy*, 1941.
- Melchett, Lord. *Modern Money*, 1932.
- Metadier, J. ed. *Solidarity*, Vol. 1, 1942.
- Milne, A. A. *War With Honour*, 1940.
- Mumford, L. *Faith for Living*, 1942.
- Munzenberg, W. *Propaganda als Waffe*, 1937.
- Murry, Middleton. "The Possibility of a Christian Society
The Fortnightly, January, 1942.
Christocracy, 1942.
- Nehru, J. *The Unity of India*, 1941.
- Neibuhr, Reinhold. *Moral Man and Immoral Society*, 1934.
- Nicolson, Harold. *Why Britain is at War*, 1942.
- Oldham. *Christianity and the Race Problem*.
- Parkes, H. B. *Marxism A Post-Martem*, 1940.
- Peter, Niereck. *Metapolitics: From Romanticism to Hitler*, 1941.
- Pick, Frank. *Paths to Peace*, 1941.
- Pitt-Rivers, G. H. L. *The Clash of Culture and the Contact of Races*, 1927.
- Populus. "Effect on Native Races of Contact with European Civilization" *Man*, 1927.
- Purdum, C. B. *My Dear Churchill—Open Letters*, 1941.
The New Order, 1941.
- Radhakrishnan, S. *Eastern Religions and Western Thought*, 1937.
- Rauching, Hermann. *Make and Break with the Nazis*, 1942.
- Reed, Herbert. *To Hell with Culture*, 1941.
- Regeurt, Captain. *Les Forces Morales*, 1937.
- Reveille, Thomas. *The Spoil of Europe: The Nazi Technique in Political and Economic Conquest*, 1942.
- Richmond, B. L. *The Pattern of Freedom*.
- Robbins, Lionel. *Economic Aspects of Federation*, 1941.
- Roberts, S. H. *Population Problems of the Pacific*.
- Robinson, Joan. *Essays in Marxian Economics*, 1942.
- Rosenberg, Arthur. *A History of Bolshevism*, 1940.
- Rosenstock—Huessy, E. *Out of Revolution*.
- Rowse, A. L. "What is Wrong with the Germans?"
The Political Quarterly, March, 1940.

- Roya, Louis. *Historie Mussolini.*
- Salter, Arthur. *Recovery*, 1982.
The Framework of an Ordered Society, 1988.
- Schuman, F. L. "War, Peace and the Balance of Power,"
*The Annals of the American Academy
of Political and Social Sciences*, 1940.
- Schweitzer, Alfred. *Philosophy of Civilization.*
- Seligman & Bryant. "Mental Development of the South African
Native."
Eugenic Review, Vol. ix.
- Sinha, Charu Chandra. "The Philosophy of Non-Violence," *Hin-
dustan Review*, April, 1942.
- Smuts, J. C. *The League of Nations : A Practical Sugges-
tion.*
- Soddy, F. *Wealth, Vital Wealth and Debt*, 1988.
- Spengler, Oswald. *Decline of the West*, (1926-28).
- Srikantha Sastri, S. "Oswald Spengler on Indian Culture,"
The New Era, March, 1929.
- Staley, Eugene. *World Economy in Transition :
Technology vs Politics.
Laissez—Faire vs Planning.
Power vs Welfare*, 1939.
- Stawell, F. M. *The Growth of International Thought*, 1929.
- Strachey, John. *A Programme for Progress*, 1940.
- Strasser, Otto. *Germany Tomorrow*, 1940.
- Streit, Clarence. *Federal Union*, 1940.
Union Now with America, 1941.
- Tawney, R. H. *The Acquisitive Society*, 1921.
- Temple, W. *Thoughts in War-Time.*
- Thomas, Norman. *Human Exploitation*, 1984.
- Thompson, Edward. *Enlist India for Freedom*, 1940.
- Thomson, J. A. and
Patrick Geddes. *Life : Outlines of General Biology*, 2 Vols.,
1981.
- Thyssen. *I Paid Hitler*, 1940.
- Thorndike, Lynn. "Peace Aims : A Specific Proposal," *The
Political Science Quarterly*, March 1942.
- Toynbee, Arnold. *Study of History*, (vols. 1984-89).
- Tracey, Herbert. *Trade Unions Fight—For What?* 1940.
- Urwick, E. J. *The Message of Plato*, 1920.
- Veblen. *Imperial Germany.*
- Ward. *No Profit, No Glory, No Need.*

- Wells, H. G. *World Brain*, 1938.
The Commonsense of War and Peace, 1940.
Babes in the Darkling Wood, 1940.
The World Order, 1940.
Guide to the New World: A Handbook of Constructive World Revolution, 1941.
Phoenix, 1942.
- Weigart. *German Geopolitics*, 1942.
- Wheare, K. C. *What Federal Government Is?* 1941.
- Werner, M. *The Military Strength of the Powers.*
- Whitehead, T. N. *Leadership in a Free Society.*
- Whyte, Frederick Sir. "Sir Stafford Cripps in India," *The Fortnightly*, May, 1942.
- Williams, F. *Democracy's Last Battle*, 1942.
- Wilson, Duncan and Elizabeth. *Federation and World Order*, 1940.
- Winter, Gustav. *This is not the End of France*, 1942.
- Woolf, L. S. *International Government*, 1927.
Imperialism and Civilization, 1928.
- Wynne. *A Supreme Senate and a Strong Empire*, 1934.
- Young, George, Sir. *Federalism and Freedom*, 1941.
- Zimmern, Alfred. *Spiritual Values and World Affairs*, 1939.
The Prospects of Civilization, 1940.

INDEX OF NAMES

A

Adler, 134
Akiyama, K. 50
Athusius, 147
Amery, L. S., 18, 19, 20, 25

B

"Balbus", 74, 179
Baudoin, Charles, 132
Benes, Dr., 77, 78, 89, 179
Bentham, 29
Bernhardi, 139
Besold, 169
Beveridge, Sir William, 70, 179
Buddha, 184
Burke, 29

C

Carr, Professor, 33, 140
Chakotin, Serge, 131
Chamberlain, Neville, 72
Chamberlain, Houston, 139
Christ, 184
Churchill, 21, 22, 32, 46, 47, 49, 71
Clausewitz, 139
Cobbon, Professor, 29
Cole, G.D.H., 52, 73, 74, 104, 179
Confucius, 184
Cripps, Sir Stafford, 22, 23, 47, 90
Croce, 144, 145, 148
Crowther, G, 91
Cuenot, 134
Curtis, Lionel, 71, 89, 179

D

Daladier, 72
de Maetzu, 84

E

Eastman, Max, 107

F

Fischte, 29, 139
Fischer, Sir John, 70
Foster, Arnold, 45, 46

G

Gandhi, Mahatma, 12, 13, 14, 17, 19,
20, 40, 132, 153, 180, 181, 182,
183, 184
Gayada, Sr., 37
Gentiles, Giovanni, 38
Gierke, 147, 170

Gill, Eric, 39
Goebbels, Dr., 38, 43, 54, 189
Goethe, 128
Gorkin, E. L. 95
Gregory, J. W., 126
Grotius, 147
Gwyer, Sir Maurice, 18

H

Haldane, Dr., 51
Hegel, 29, 38, 144
Herder, 128, 139
Hert, 169
Hitler, Herr, 15, 24, 36, 43, 50, 54, 61,
62, 78, 132, 186, 187
Hobbes, 85, 147
Humboldt, 128, 170
Huxley, 124
Hugo, 109

J

Jinnah, M. A., 19
Joad, Professor, 104, 130

K

Kamikawa, H., 50
Kant, 85, 139
Keeton, Professor, 89, 120, 179
Keith, Sir Arthur, 124
Kranold, Dr. Hermann, 35

L

Laski, Professor, 74, 104, 116, 179
Le Bon, 132
Lenin, 19, 34, 105, 137
Lerner, Max, 107
Lloyd, Lord, 121
Lothan, Marquis of, 143

M

Machiavelli, 1
Madariaga, S, 180
Mahan, Admiral, 143
Marx, 1, 34, 94, 104, 106, 107, 133,
139, 144, 170
McDougall, William 6, 121, 122
McGovern, Professor, 43
Macmillan, Professor, 97
Menzies, 94
Montesquieu, 170
Morris, William, 39
Murry, Middleton, 150
Mussolini, 187

N

Nehru, Jawaharlal, 16, 21, 42, 142
Neibhur, Reinhold, 85
Nietzsche, 139

P

Pavlov, 181
Pitt-Rivers, 123
Pollit, Harry, 90
Pufendorf, 169
Purdom, 83, 84, 85, 179

R

Radhakrishnan, Sir S., 129
Read, Herbert, 39
Reguert, 135
Robbins, Professor, 98, 99
Roosevelt, 12, 36
Rosenberg, 139
Rousseau, 40, 79, 131
Rowse, 138

Samkara, 3, 4, 10
Sapru, Sir Tej Bahadur, 22

Sastri, The Rt. Hon'ble Srinivasa, 22
Srikantha Sastri, Professor, 1-5
Shascht, Dr., 53, 91
Shelley, 15
Spengler, Oswald, 1-5
Stalin, 55, 57, 90, 106, 109
Strasser, Dr. Otto, 79, 81, 89, 179
Streit, Clarence, 70, 71, 89, 179

T

Takahashi, Admiral, 49
Treitschke, 139
Trotsky, 81, 55, 105
Toynbee, Professor, 28
Turgeniev, 6

W

Ward, Barbara, 70, 89, 179
Wells, H. G., 31, 32, 81, 82, 83, 89, 105,
109, 121, 129, 180
Wells, Sumner, 47
Whitehead, Professor, 59
Williams, Francis, 26
Wilson Elizabeth & Duncan, 87
Wilson, President, 44
Woolf, Leonard, 66, 89, 140

